DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 661 TM 004 931

AUTHOR	Nesset, Bonna; And Others
TITLE	Minneapolis Human Relations Program: An Evaluation 1972-1973. No. C-72-3.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	C-72-3
PUB DATE	Dec 73
NOTE	93p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Communication Skills; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; *Human Relations Programs; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Staff; *Integration Readiness; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Racial Integration; *School Integration; *School Personnel; School Surveys; Staff Improvement; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Minneapolis Human Relations Program; Minneapolis Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

The first phase of the Minneapolis Public Schools' Desegregation/integration Plan involved a human relations oriented staff development program which focused on improving communication skills. The goal of the Human Relations Program for 1972-73 was to change the climate in the schools in preparation for desegregation and integration. The object of teaching communication skills was to overcome any communication barriers caused by isolation and to have the staffs serve as models for communicating and interacting. Anonymous questionnaires seeking participant reactions to the program were administered in every school and special site in the district in April 1973. Most of the respondents were nonadministrative certificated staff-teachers, social workers, counselors, and librarians. Respondents also included teacher aides, clerical staff, administrators, and custodial staff. Most said they found the program useful, improved their communication skills, and thought the program had improved interpersonal relations. While most of the participants thought the program was possibly, though not directly related to desegregation/integration, fewer thought it had made the climate more conducive to desegregation/integration, and fewer still thought it would actually help implement the desegregation/integration plan. Opinions concerning the overall value of the program were about evenly divided between those who said it was worthwhile and those who said it wasn't. (Author/DEP)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED115661

Minneapolis Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Minneapolis Human Relations Program
An Evaluation
1972-1973

Bonna Nesset
Administrative Assistant

R. W. Faunce
Director for Research and Evaluation

Sara H. Clark
Research Assistant

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the offical position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

TM004 931

December 1973
C-72-3

Research and Evaluation Department
Planning and Support Services
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

Minneapolis Public Schools

Minneapolis Human Relations Program: An Evaluation 1972-1973

Summary

See page

The first phase of the Minneapolis Public Schools' Desegregation/Integration Plan involved a human relations oriented staff development program which focused on improving communication skills. The 1972-73 Human Relations Program (HRP) was implemented through an already existing early dismissal schedule called the Tuesday Release Program. Program planning and training of leaders took place during the summer and fall of 1972, and the individualized programs, based on each school's needs assessment, were conducted in the schools for 10 early release days between January and April, 1973. p. 1-2

The goal of the HRP for 1972-73 was to change the climate in the schools in preparation for desegregation and integration. The object of teaching communication skills was to overcome any communication barriers caused by isolation and to have the staffs serve as models for communicating and interacting.

Anonymous questionnaires seeking participant reactions to the program were administered in every school and special site in the district in April 1973. The return rate was about 80%. Most of the respondents were non-administrative certificated staff--teachers, social workers, counselors, and librarians. Respondents also included teacher aides, clerical staff, administrators and custodial staff. p. 3

Although some participants may not have related the developing of communication skills and the issues of desegregation and integration, most of them said they found the program useful, improved their communication skills, thought the program had improved interpersonal relations, and thought students were favorably affected--even though the program was designed to include staff only. Almost all the participants indicated they themselves had some involvement in the program. While most of the participants thought the program was possibly, though not directly related to desegregation/integration, fewer thought it had made the climate more conducive to desegregation/integration and fewer still thought it would actually help implement the desegregation/integration plan. Opinions concerning the overall value of the program were about evenly divided between those who said it was worthwhile and those who said it wasn't. More people saw a need for further human relations training in their school than were willing to engage in such training themselves. p. 3-13

Opinions of participants who worked in elementary schools were consistently more positive toward the program than were the opinions of the secondary school staffs. p. 14-23

Generally, participants from desegregating schools, those involved in relatively major transfers of student enrollment, held less positive attitudes toward the HRP than did the rest of the p. 24-37

participants. Differences between desegregating staffs and other staffs were more pronounced at the secondary level. Respondents from desegregating schools were also more likely to view their programs as related desegregation.

Staff opinions were analyzed separately for the North Area, East Area, West Area, and Southeast Alternatives. The SEA staff was the most positive at the elementary level and the least positive at the secondary level (SEA secondary respondents were all from one school). The East Area respondents gave more positive responses at the secondary level. Responses at the elementary level, with the exception of SEA, did not differ among the areas. p. 38-53

Responses of staff members holding clerical, custodial, administrative, certificated, and teacher aide positions were compared on each question. Administrative and non-administrative certificated staff members responded more favorably to the HRP at both the elementary and secondary levels than did respondents holding other positions. Custodians were least involved and responded least favorably to the program. A tendency was evident for people to see participants in their own job category as more highly involved than did people in other positions. p. 54-67

There was no clear pattern of differences between responses from participants from schools which had had previous human relations training through Project 934 and/or Project 822 and the rest of the participants. However, there was a slight trend for the 934 elementary schools to be more positively oriented toward the program than were respondents citywide and for the respondents from the 822 elementary schools to be less positively oriented. At the secondary level the 822 respondents were more similar to the 934 respondents and both groups varied less from the city-total results. At the secondary level, these two groups were frequently more positive toward the program than were respondents citywide. Differences between the earlier programs and the HRP were noted. p. 68-77

Individual school results were returned to each school and and are available on request.

Conclusions and recommendations were given.

* * *

Contents

	Page
City Total Results	4
Program Objectives	4
Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	6
Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	6
Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	8
Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	10
Perceived Value of the Program	11
Summary	12
Results for Elementary and Seondary Schools	14
Program Objectives	14
Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	15
Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	17
Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	19
Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	20
Perceived Value of the Program	21
Summary	22
Results for Desegregating Schools and All Other Schools	24
Program Objectives	24
Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	25
Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	27
Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	30
Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	30
Perceived Value of the Program	30
Summary	36
Results by Area	38
Program Objectives	38
Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	39
Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	41
Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	45
Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	48
Perceived Value of the Program	48
Summary	53
Results for Respondents Holding Different Positions	54
Program Objectives	54
Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	56
Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	57
Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	63
Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	63

Perceived Value of the Program. 63
Summary 67

Results for Schools Which Have Had Previous Human Relations Training 68

Program Objectives. 68
Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP 70
Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships. 70
Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration. 72
Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students. 74
Perceived Value of the Program. 75
Summary 77

Conclusions and Recommendations. 78

Appendix. 80

List of Tables

Table		Page
	City Total Results	
1	Program Objectives	5
2	Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	7
3	Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	9
4	Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	10
5	Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	11
6	Perceived Value of the Program	11
	Results for Elementary and Secondary Schools	
7	Program Objectives	15
8	Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	16
9	Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	18
10	Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	19
11	Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	20
12	Perceived Value of the Program	21
	Results for Desegregating Schools and All Other Schools	
13	Program Objectives	26
14	Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	28, 29
15	Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	31, 32
16	Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	33
17	Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	33
18	Perceived Value of the Program	35
	Results by Area	
19	Program Objectives	40
20	Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	42, 43
21	Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	46, 47
22	Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	49
23	Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	50
24	Perceived Value of the Program	52
	Results for Respondents Holding Different Positions	
25	Program Objectives	55
26	Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	58, 59
27	Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	61, 62
28	Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	64
29	Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	65
30	Perceived Value of the Program	66
	Results for Schools Which Have Had Previous Human Relations Training	
31	Program Objectives	69
32	Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP	71
33	Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships	73
34	Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration	74
35	Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students	75
36	Perceived Value of the Program	76

Minneapolis Public Schools

Minneapolis Human Relations Program: An Evaluation 1972-1973

In the spring of 1972 the Minneapolis Public Schools' Board of Education adopted a comprehensive plan for desegregation and integration. This plan was concerned with the humanistic requirements of integration in addition to the physical conditions required for desegregation.

The system's past efforts aimed at desegregation have included the drafting of the 1967 and 1970 Human Relations Guidelines, the establishment of human relations chairpersons in each school, a voluntary transfer program, the pairing of selected schools, a Task Force on Ethnic Studies, and special days for ethnic recognition.

The first step leading to district-wide desegregation and integration involved preparing the staff for the changes that would follow. A human relations oriented staff development program was planned for the 1972-73 school year. By utilizing an existent district-wide early dismissal schedule, the Tuesday Release Time Program, it was expected that staff in every building, over 5,000 participants, would be able to take part in this program, which focussed on developing communication skills.

Attendance at the Tuesday human relations training sessions was mandatory for all staff members. However, some departures from the planned program did occur. Every third Tuesday was set aside for school business and was therefore not available for human relations training. In addition, conflicts in scheduling prevented some staff members' attending the mandated schedule of programs, and special arrangements were necessary in these cases. Finally, twelve schools opted to design their own alternative human relations programs--not necessarily completely devoted to the educational process of developing commication skills.

The Human Relations Program (HRP) was funded locally, and the budget for the first school year's operation was set at approximately $60,000. The Human Relations Training staff consisted of the Special Assistant to the Superintendent for Desegregation/Integration, two teachers on special assignment, and one clerk-typist. In addition, specialists from outside the system were employed for some of the training sessions.

The program began in the fall of 1972. Initially it involved the development of a cadre of 15 communications specialists, enlisted from the existing school system staff. These people then took part in the training of an existing system-wide network of human relations chairpersons and administrators

from each building. Each building also formed its own human relations committee. The human relations chairpersons and building administrators, with their respective in-house human relations committees, directed the Tuesday afternoon human relations training sessions in their individual schools. The Human Relations Training staff and the cadre of communication specialists continued to serve as consultants and facilitators.

Each school did a communication skills needs assessment in November so that planning for each individual building's human relations training program would be specifically relevant to the problems and needs identified by the staff. The individual school training programs began in January 1973 and continued for 10 Tuesday afternoons between January and April when pupils were released ninety minutes early.

The HRP was designed to focus on the development of communication skills among the staff as the first year's goal because it was felt that if desegregation, (involving bringing people of different backgrounds together physically) was to insure integration (involving knowledge of, acceptance of, and trust and respect among people of diverse backgrounds), effective communication among the individuals involved must be the necessary first step.

The program directed attention to the processes by which new information is shared and accepted by individuals. The program was concerned with such things as developing awareness of the processes of interpersonal interaction, awareness of the existance of and effects of sub-groups in the organization, and developing commitment to the organizational goals for desegregation and integration. The communication skills learned would hopefully find application in achieving a heightened staff awareness and acceptance of the changes that would be encountered as a result of desegregation.

The major goal of the Human Relations Program was to prepare a learning environment for diversity and to create a system-wide positive response to the desegregation/integration mandate. The objectives for the first year were:

1. To train a cadre of communication specialists to serve as consultants/facilitators and technical assistant resources for the system in its desegregation/integration effort.

2. To create meaningful leadership roles for principals and teachers in developing human relations programs within their own schools.

3. To train principals and human relations chairpersons from local schools to develop effective training exercises and programs for the Tuesday Release sessions.

4. To develop a system-wide planning capability which would enable school personnel to assume relevant functions in the Desegregation/ Integration Plan with an emphasis on developing planning capability at the school building level.

5. To train faculty members to work in groups and teams to achieve intergroup relations goals.

6. To engage teachers and administrators to plan and implement an effective system-wide Human Relations Day with full student involvement.

7. To devise an evaluative mechanism for determining whether this use of the Tuesday Release Project was an effective strategy for preparing school personnel for integration.

Each of the individual building programs included a system-wide student-centered Human Relations Day in April which was an effort to increase communications between students, teachers and the school community. Communication skills learned in the HRP were put to use when each school developed its own program to meet the individual human relations needs of its students and faculty. The Human Relations Day programs focussed on using the communication processes the staff had learned in the 10 Tuesday sessions, inviting community representatives, and using the community as a classroom.

The Tuesday, April 24 session in each school was set aside for program evaluation. A questionnaire, developed jointly by the Department of Intergroup Education and the Department of Research and Evaluation, was distributed to all participants by the human relations chairperson in each school.

Questionnaires were completed anonymously and then immediately collected by the human relations chairpersons and returned to the Research and Evaluation Department. Two schools did not return questionnaires.

Unfortunately, the day which had been set aside for the HRP evaluation was also subsequently selected as the day to collect data required by the U.S. Office of Civil Rights to show that the Minneapolis Public Schools were in compliance with the Emergency School Aid Act regulations concerning classroom segregation. It is doubtful that the staff took as much time and effort to complete the HRP evaluation questionnaire as they might have, had they not just spent so much of their day providing data for this other assessment. It would be hard to predict any specific effect of this evaluation overload, but it would seem unlikely that these circumstances would have made respondents think more positively about the HRP evaluation on that day.

Results were presented to the administrators and human relations chairpersons at a Saturday, May 5, 1973, workshop. Subsequently, more questionnaires were returned and results were retabulated for all schools whose final tallies increased by 10% over the early returns. This report is based on all responses received by July 1, 1973. Questionnaires received from the two missing schools plus additional questionnaires from other schools are included. Citywide results based on these additional questionnaires did not differ significantly from the original results presented at the May 5 workshop.

The questionnaire is reporduced in the appendix. City total responses are shown as percentages. Page 3 of the questionnaire refers to the different activities that could be chosen for the various individual school programs. Individual schools used results for these questions to assess the various activities used and skills acquired, but city total results for these questions do not lead to meaningful interpretation.

The return rate was about 80%, with 4,087 participants completing questionnaires. Almost three-fourths (74%) of the respondents classified themselves as non-administrative certificated staff. This group included teachers, librarians, nurses, counselors, and consultants. Nine percent of the respondents were teacher aides, 5% were clerical staff, 4% were administrators, and 2% were custodial staff. Although the program was designed primarily for school staff, some schools did include a few people from the community and students. (School-community programs were anticipated as a future step in the HRP.) About one percent of the sample (22 people) were community participants, and only two respondents were students. Six percent of the respondents said they were in some other group not included in these seven categories.

City Total Results

Program Objectives

Most of the respondents were aware of the objectives of the Human Relations Program (HRP) and viewed them favorably. However, a sizable minority of the participants indicated a lack of knowledge about the goals or viewed them as not related to their communication needs. Sixty-one percent said they had a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the program, but 39% of the participants said, after 10 human relations training sessions, that they did not have a clear idea of the goals.

Although 63% (Table 2) said they personally had some input into what the Tuesday programs would be, just over half (Table 1) thought the communication needs identified by their school or group in November were the more important communication needs. One-fifth said they did not think the more important communication needs had been identified, and another one-fourth said they were not sure what needs had been identified.

Almost seven out of ten respondents said the HRP in their school or group was related to their group's communication needs: thirty-two percent said the program was related to their needs and effective in meeting them, but 37% said although the program was related to their needs it was not effective in meeting them. Another eighteen percent said the program was useful even though it was not related to their communication needs, and 13% said the program was neither need-related nor useful. Thus, half of the participants said the program was effective in meeting their group's more important communication needs or at least useful to them even though it was not directly related to their needs.

Table 1. Program Objectives

Question	Response	City Total Percent N=4087[1]
Did you have a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the Human Relations Program?	Yes	61%
	No	39
Do you think that the communication needs identified by your school or group were the more important communication needs of your school or group?	Yes	54
	No	20
	Not sure what needs were identified	26
Was the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the communication needs of your school or group?	Related to our needs and effective in meeting them	32
	Related to our needs, but not effective in meeting them	37
	Not related to our needs, but useful	18
	Not related to our needs and not useful	13

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 3,659.

Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of involvement of various groups in the Tuesday human relations programs. Almost all of the participants indicated that they personally had at least some involvment in the programs. Only 2% said they had no involvement, and 62% indicated a high level of involvement ("much" or "tremendous").

The community, students, and the custodial staff were seen as the least involved groups and the certificated staff and administrators were seen as the most involved groups. It was not expected that students or community representatives would be highly involved, since the program was not specifically designed to include them at that point in time. Over three-fourths of the respondents rated the certificated staff's involvement as "much" or "tremendous," and almost two-thirds rated the administrators' involvement this high.

Over half of the respondents said that their human relations chairperson most frequently led the sessions. Another 39% said one of the human relations committee members most frequently led the sessions, 3% didn't know, and 4% specified some other person as the most frequent leader. See Table 2 on page 7.

Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

Participants were more likely to state that they had improved their interpersonal communications skills--or that their school had improved--than they were to state that other groups had improved. Almost two-thirds of the participants (62%) agreed that they had improved their interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP (38% disagreed). When asked to indicate whether communications had improved for various groups involved in their program, less than half of the respondents (44%) said they thought the HRP had resulted in improved communications among the total staff. One-fourth said communications did not improve, five percent said there was no improvement needed, and 26% said they didn't know.

More people (47%) thought communication had improved among teachers than for any other group in their program. Another 7% said no improvement in communication was needed among teachers. Still, over one-fifth (22%) said there had not been an improvement and almost one-fourth (24%) didn't know.

Only 31% thought communications had improved between teachers and administrators, but 9% of the respondents said there was no improvement needed. Over one-fourth (28%) said there had been no improvement, and another one-third (32%) said they didn't know.

Table 2. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Question	Response	City Total Percent N=4087[1]
How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your Human Relations Program?		
Clerical staff	None	4 %
	Some	48
	Much	36
	Tremendous	6
	Don't Know	5
Custodial staff	None	17
	Some	56
	Much	18
	Tremendous	6
	Don't Know	5
Certificated staff	None	1
	Some	19
	Much	54
	Tremendous	22
	Don't Know	3
Teacher Aides	None	6
	Some	43
	Much	36
	Tremendous	9
	Don't Know	7
Administrators	None	4
	Some	28
	Much	46
	Tremendous	17
	Don't Know	5
Students	None	25
	Some	57
	Much	8
	Tremendous	2
	Don't Know	8
Community	None	33
	Some	46
	Much	5
	Tremendous	1
	Don't Know	15
Yourself	None	2
	Some	35
	Much	45
	Tremendous	17
	Don't Know	1
Others	None	9
	Some	21
	Much	11
	Tremendous	10
	Don't Know	49
Who most often led the Human Relations Programs for your school or group?	Human relations chairperson	53
	Human relations committee member	39
	Don't Know	3
	Other	4
I had some input into what the Tuesday Human Relations Programs would be	Agree	63
	Disagree	37

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 3,659.

Almost one-third (32%) thought communications had improved between staff and students, 26% saw no improvement, only 5% said there was no improvement needed, and 37% didn't know. More respondents (41%) noted an improvement in communications between certificated and civil service personnel, but 21% said there had been no improvement, 11% said there was none needed, and 27% didn't know. Fewer respondents, only 17%, thought communications had improved between school and community than for any other groups. Thirty percent saw no improvement, half didn't know, and only 3% said there was no improvement needed.

Almost seven out of ten respondents (69%) thought the HRP had improved interpersonal relations in their school: 6% said things had improved greatly, and 63% said things had improved some. One-fifth said the HRP had not improved interpersonal relations, 6% said things became worse, and 5% said there was no improvement needed. About half (51%) agreed that the members of their group or school developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP (49% disagreed). See Table 3 on page 9.

Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Most of the respondents did not see the HRP as directly related to the desegregation/integration plans. (32% of these respondents were from schools which would, as a result of the desegregation plan, serve changed student bodies beginning in the 1973 or the 1974 school year. The Spring, 1973 enrollment at these schools represented 31% of the total student body). Almost one-fourth (23%) said the program was not related to desegregation. About six of ten (59%) said the program was possibly related, but that the relationship was not clear. Only 18% said the program was directly related to desegregation.

About one-third agreed that the climate within their school or group was more conducive to desegregation/integration as a result of the HRP, but 64% disagreed.

About one-fourth (26%) said the HRP would help their staff implement the desegregation/integration plan, and over one-third (35%) said they didn't know whether the program would help or not. However, 38% said the HRP would not help their staff implement the plan, 21% indicating the programs were not relevant to desegregation and 17% indicating they did not learn anything related to desegregation.

Table 3. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

Question	Response	City Total Percent N=4087[1]
I feel that I improved my interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP	Agree	62%
	Disagree	38
Did communications improve in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program?		
The total staff	Yes, Improved	44
	No, Did Not Improve	25
	No, But Needed No Improvement	5
	Don't Know	26
Among teachers	Yes, Improved	47
	No, Did Not Improve	22
	No, But Needed No Improvement	7
	Don't Know	24
Between teachers and administrators	Yes, Improved	31
	No, Did Not Improve	28
	No, But Needed No Improvement	9
	Don't Know	32
Between staff and students	Yes, Improved	32
	No, Did Not Improve	26
	No, But Needed No Improvement	5
	Don't Know	37
Between certificated and civil service personnel	Yes, Improved	41
	No, Did Not Improve	21
	No, But Needed No Improvement	11
	Don't Know	27
School and community	Yes, Improved	17
	No, Did Not Improve	30
	No, But Needed No Improvement	3
	Don't Know	50
Overall, what impact did the human relations program have on interpersonal relations in your school or group?	Improved greatly	6
	Improved some	63
	Did not improve	20
	Became worse	6
	No improvement was needed	5
The members of my school or group developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP	Agree	51
	Disagree	49

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 3,659.

Thus, while the majority of the participants thought the program might possibly be related to the desegregation plan, most did not see a direct relationship, few thought it had made the climate more conducive to desegregation, and fewer still thought it would actually help implement the plan. See Table 4.

Table 4. Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Question	Response	City Total Percent N=4087[1]
Was the purpose of the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the desegregation-integration plans of the Minneapolis Public Schools?	Yes, directly related to desegregation	18%
	Possibly, but the relationship was not clear	59
	No, not related to desegregation	23
Will the Human Relations Program help your staff implement the desegregation-integration plan in your school or group?	Yes	26
	No, programs not relevant to desegregation	21
	No, did not learn anything related to desegregation	17
	Don't know	35
The climate within my school or group is more conducive to desegregation-integration as a result of the HRP	Agree	36
	Disagree	64

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 3,659.

Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Although less than one percent of the respondents to the questionnaire were students, most of the respondents did feel that students were favorably affected by the program. Almost three-fourths of the respondents (73%) said they thought the student-centered Human Relations Day on April 10 was a success. About seven out of ten (69%) agreed they learned some things from the HRP that would enable them to create better learning environments (31% disagreed), and 43% agreed that they were now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP.

Table 5. Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Question	Response	City Total Percent N=4087[1]
The Human Relations day on April 10 was a success	Agree	73%
	Disagree	27
I learned some things from the HRP that will enable me to create better learning environments	Agree	69
	Disagree	31
I am now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP	Agree	43
	Disagree	57

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 3,659.

Perceived Value of the Program

Participants' opinions concerning the overall value of the program were relatively evenly divided. Slightly over half said the HRP was either worthwhile (45%) or very worthwhile (9%) to them. Slightly less than half said it was either not very worthwhile (37%) or worthless (9%).

Almost two-thirds of the participants (62%) said there was a need for more human relations training within their school or group. However, less than half (46%) agreed they were interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning (54% disagreed). Forty-one percent of the respondents said their group had made some plans as a result of the HRP.

Table 6. Perceived Value of the Program

Question	Response	City Total Percent N=4087[1]
All in all, how worthwhile was the Tuesday Human Relations Program to you?	Very worthwhile	9%
	Worthwhile	45
	Not very worthwhile	37
	Worthless	9
There is a need for more human relations training within my school or group	Agree	62
	Disagree	38
I am interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning	Agree	46
	Disagree	54
Our school or group has made some plans as a result of the HRP	Agree	41
	Disagree	59

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 3,659.

Summary

About six of ten participants said they were aware of the purpose of the HRP. About half said their school's needs assessment had identified the most important communication needs upon which to focus their program, and about half said the program was effective in meeting the needs or at least useful to them even though it might not have been related to their communication needs.

Almost all of the participants indicated they themselves had had at least some involvement in the programs in their school. Most of the participants said the programs were most frequently led by their human relations chairperson.

Almost two-thirds said they had improved their communication skills as a result of the program, but less than half said communications had improved among the total staff of their school. Over two-thirds thought the HRP had improved interpersonal relations in their school.

While most of the participants thought the program was possibly, though not directly, related to desegregation, fewer thought it had made the climate more conducive to desegregation and fewer still thought it would actually help implement the plan.

Although the program was not designed, at this first stage, to involve students or community, it was hoped that seeing teachers and other staff members--as a result of this program--regularly involved in meaningful communication would provide a positive model of behavior for the students served by this staff.

Most of the respondents thought students were favorably affected by the program. The Human Relations Day was seen as a success, and the participants said they had learned some things that would enable them to create better learning environments, although most of them were not yet doing anything differently in working with students as a result of the program.

Opinions concerning the overall value of the program were about evenly divided between those who said it was worthwhile and those who said it wasn't. More people saw a need for further human relations training in their school than were willing to engage in such training themselves. This could indicate that many respondents thought everyone else but themselves needed such training or that possibly many just didn't like the specific approach used for this effort and might be more receptive to a different type of program.

Even though some of the staff did not, in their own minds, relate the development of communication skills to the issue of integration, it was encouraging that in a system this large and this diverse (e.g., some schools at the junior high level were faced with the reality of desegregation for the coming fall, whereas the elementary schools would not be affected until the next year, and some schools would remain virtually unchanged) a promising majority of the entire staff felt they had gained from their school's program.

In the next section, a comparison of responses from elementary and secondary schools is given. The presentation in the next and in the following sections follow the same format used in the first section:

Program Objectives
Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP
Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships
Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration
Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students
Perceived Value of the Program
Summary

Results for Elementary and Secondary Schools[1]

Opinions of participants who worked in elementary schools were consistently more positive toward the HRP than were opinions of secondary school staffs. Because these differences were so pronounced all results were analyzed by school level.

Program Objectives

While about half (53%) of the secondary staff said they were familiar with the goals of the HRP, almost seven out of ten (69%) elementary staff members said they had a clear idea of the purpose of the program.

Elementary staffs were more likely to feel that the communication needs identified by their school were important ones. Almost two-thirds (63%) of the elementary respondents compared with 43% of the secondary respondents thought the more important needs had been identified. More secondary respondents (30%) than elementary respondents (22%) said they were not sure what needs were identified.

Three-fourths of the elementary participants said the HRP was related to their school's communication needs: 42% said the program was need-related and effective in meeting these needs, and 33% said although the program was need-related it was not effective. By comparison, 62% of the secondary staff said the program was related to their communication needs: 20% said the program was related to their needs and effective, and 42% said although it was need-related it was not effective in meeting these needs. Eighteen percent of each group said the program was useful even though it was not related to their communication needs. Only seven percent of elementary respondents compared with one-fifth of the secondary respondents thought the program was neither related to their communication needs nor useful. Thus 60% of the elementary and 38% of the secondary participants said the program was effective in meeting their groups' more important communication needs or at least useful to them even if it was not directly related to their needs. See Table 7 on page 15.

[1] Results for non-school sites and the SEA Free School are not included.

Table 7. Program Objectives

Question	Response	Elementary Percent[1] N=2072	Secondary Percent[2] N=1897
Did you have a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the Human Relations Program?	Yes	69%	53%
	No	31	47
Do you think that the communication needs identified by your school or group were the more important communication needs of your school or group?	Yes	63	43
	No	15	27
	Not sure what needs were identified	22	30
Was the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the communication needs of your school or group?	Related to our needs and effective in meeting them	42	20
	Related to our needs, but not effective in meeting them	33	42
	Not related to our needs, but useful	18	18
	Not related to our needs and not useful	7	20

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 1828.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 1728.

Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of involvement of various groups in their Tuesday programs. Almost all the respondents from the elementary and secondary schools indicated they had at least some personal involvement in the program, but the elementary staffs were more likely to indicate a higher level of involvement ("much" or "tremendous") while the secondary staffs more frequently said they had "some" involvement. Seven out of ten elementary respondents said they had a high level of involvement in the program, but only about half (53%) of the secondary participants said they had been involved to this extent.

For elementary and secondary participants alike, students, custodial staff, and the community were seen as least involved while certificated staff and administrators were seen as most involved of the groups compared. All the groups considered were seen as more highly involved by the elementary staffs than by the secondary staffs. Elementary respondents more frequently said the program in their school was led by their human relations chairperson, while more secondary respondents indicated that a committee member led their program. A larger proportion of the elementary participants (69%) than the secondary participants (57%) agreed they had some input in to what the HRP would be. See Table 8 on page 16.

Table 8 Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Question	Response	Elementary Percent N=2072[1]	Secondary Percent N=1897[2]
How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your Human Relations Program?			
Clerical staff	None	3%	5%
	Some	41	57
	Much	43	28
	Tremendous	9	3
	Don't Know	3	7
Custodial staff	None	15	17
	Some	55	58
	Much	21	14
	Tremendous	4	2
	Don't Know	4	9
Certificated staff	None	-	1
	Some	13	26
	Much	55	54
	Tremendous	30	15
	Don't Know	2	4
Teacher Aides	None	5	5
	Some	39	49
	Much	42	30
	Tremendous	12	5
	Don't Know	3	11
Administrators	None	3	5
	Some	24	33
	Much	48	44
	Tremendous	22	11
	Don't Know	3	7
Students	None	23	26
	Some	56	59
	Much	10	6
	Tremendous	3	1
	Don't Know	8	8
Community	None	29	37
	Some	51	42
	Much	7	3
	Tremendous	1	-
	Don't Know	13	17
Yourself	None	1	3
	Some	29	42
	Much	50	40
	Tremendous	20	13
	Don't Know	1	2
Who most often led the Human Relations Programs for your school or group?	Human relations chairperson	67	38
	Human relations committee member	29	52
	Don't Know	2	6
	Other	3	4
I had some input into what the Tuesday Human Relations Programs would be	Agree	69	57
	Disagree	31	43

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 1828.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 1728.

Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

While about half (51%) of the secondary participants said they had improved their communication skills as a result of the HRP, 71% of the elementary participants said they had. When asked to indicate whether communications had improved for various groups involved in their program, about half (52%) of the elementary respondents, and about one-third (35%) of the secondary respondents said communications had improved among the total staff. For both groups, the most improvement in communication was seen among teachers (53% for elementary staffs and 41% for secondary). For all groups compared, a higher proportion of secondary respondents than elementary respondents said communications did not improve for the groups condisered. Communications between school and community were seen as least improved by both groups. In spite of the fact that the non-administrative certificated staff and the administrators were seen as the two most involved groups, lack of improvement in communications between teachers and administrators was also evidenced in both groups.

Elementary respondents were more likely to say that overall, the impact of the HRP was to improve interpersonal relations in their school. Three-fourths of the elementary respondents compared with 62% of the secondary respondents said the program had improved interpersonal relations. In contrast, over one-third (35%) of the secondary respondents, but less than one-fifth (19%) of the elementary respondents said things did not improve or actually became worse.

While 60% of the elementary respondents agreed (40% disagreed) that the members of their school had developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP, the proportions were reversed for the secondary participants with only 41% agreeing. See Table 9 on page 18.

Table 9. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

Question	Response	Elementary Percent N=2072[1]	Secondary Percent N=1897[2]
I feel that I improved my interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP	Agree	71%	51%
	Disagree	29	49
Did communications improve in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program?			
The total staff	Yes, Improved	52	35
	No, Did Not Improve	19	31
	No, But Needed No Improvement	6	4
	Don't Know	23	31
Among teachers	Yes, Improved	53	41
	No, Did Not Improve	18	28
	No, But Needed No Improvement	8	5
	Don't Know	22	26
Between teachers and administrators	Yes, Improved	35	26
	No, Did Not Improve	23	35
	No, But Needed No Improvement	11	6
	Don't Know	31	32
Between staff and students	Yes, Improved	39	25
	No, Did Not Improve	17	35
	No, But Needed No Improvement	6	4
	Don't Know	39	36
Between certificated and civil service personnel	Yes, Improved	44	38
	No, Did Not Improve	16	26
	No, But Needed No Improvement	13	8
	Don't Know	26	28
School and community	Yes, Improved	24	10
	No, Did Not Improve	23	38
	No, But Needed No Improvement	3	3
	Don't Know	50	50
Overall, what impact did the human relations program have on interpersonal relations in your school or group?	Improved greatly	7	4
	Improved some	67	58
	Did not improve	15	27
	Became worse	4	8
	No improvement was needed	6	3
The members of my school or group developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP	Agree	60	41
	Disagree	40	59

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 1828.

[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 1728.

Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

The elementary staff was only slightly more likely than the secondary staff to see the HRP as related to the desegregation/integration plan. Nineteen percent of the elementary participants and 16% of the secondary participants saw the program as directly related to desegregation. Fifty-nine percent of the elementary staff and 60% of the secondary staff said there was a possible relationship, but that it was not clear. Twenty-two percent of the elementary and 24% of the secondary staff said the program was not related to desegregation.

Although the elementary respondents did not differ greatly from the secondary staff in seeing a direct relationship between the HRP and the desegregation/integration plan, they were much more likely to see the program as potentially helpful to desegregation. One-third of the elementary staff but only 19% of the secondary staff said the program would help them implement the desegregation/integration plan in their school. Almost one-half (47%) of the secondary but only 31% of the elementary respondents said the programs were not relevant to desegregation or they did not learn anything related to desegregation.

Forty-four percent of the elementary participants compared with 28% of the secondary participants agreed that the climate within their school was more conducive to desegregation/integration as a result of the HRP.

Table 10. Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Question	Response	Elementary Percent N=2072[1]	Secondary Percent N=1897[2]
Was the purpose of the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the desegregation-integration plans of the Minneapolis Public Schools?	Yes, directly related to desegreg.	19%	16%
	Possibly, but the relationship was not clear	59	60
	No, not related to desegregation	22	24
Will the Human Relations Program help your staff implement the desegregation-integration plan in your school or group?	Yes	33	19
	No, programs not relevant to desegregation	19	24
	No, did not learn anything related to desegregation	12	23
	Don't Know	36	35
The climate within my school or group is more conducive to desegregation-integration as a result of the HRP	Agree	44	28
	Disagree	56	72

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 1828.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " 1728.

Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Opinions of the elementary respondents concerning the effects of the program on students were consistently more positive than those of the secondary staff. While nine of ten elementary participants agreed that Human Relations Day had been a success, about half (55%) of the secondary staff thought so.

Almost eight of ten (79%) elementary participants compared with 58% of the secondary staff agreed they learned some things from the program that would enable them to create better learning environments.

While over half (52%) of the elementary staff said they were doing something differently in working with students as a result of the program, only about one-third (35%) of the secondary staff agreed changes had been made.

Table 11. Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Question	Response	Elementary Percent N=2072[1]	Secondary Percent N=1897[2]
The Human Relations day on April 10 was a success	Agree	90%	55%
	Disagree	10	45
I learned some things from the HRP that will enable me to create better learning environments	Agree	79	58
	Disagree	21	42
I am now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP	Agree	52	35
	Disagree	48	65

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 1828.

[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 1728.

Perceived Value of the Program

Two-thirds of the elementary staff compared with 42% of the secondary staff said the program had been worthwhile or very worthwhile to them. In contrast, almost six of ten (58%) secondary respondents compared with about one-third (35%) of the elementary respondents said the program had been either not very worthwhile or worthless.

About the same proportion of elementary and secondary respondents (63% and 61% respectively) agreed there was a need for more human relations training within their schools. However, the elementary staff was more likely to voice an interest in further participation in human relations programs. Half of the elementary staff and 42% of the secondary staff would like to take part in more human relations programs.

Almost half (48%) of the elementary staff compared with one-third of the secondary staff said their school had made some plans as a result of the program.

Table 12. Perceived Value of the Program

Question	Response	Elementary Percent N=2072[1]	Secondary Percent N=1897[2]
All in all, how worthwhile was the Tuesday Human Relations Program to you?	Very worthwhile	12%	6%
	Worthwhile	54	36
	Not very worthwhile	30	45
	Worthless	5	13
There is a need for more human relations training within my school or group	Agree	63	61
	Disagree	37	39
I am interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning	Agree	50	42
	Disagree	50	58
Our school or group has made some plans as a result of the HRP	Agree	48	33
	Disagree	52	67

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 1828.

[2] " " " " " " " " " " 1728.

Summary

Opinions of participants who worked in elementary schools were consistently more positive toward the program than were the opinions of the secondary school staffs. A greater proportion of the elementary respondents said they had a clear idea of the purpose of the program. They more frequently indicated that the communication needs identified by their school were the more important ones and that the program was related to those needs. About six of ten elementary participants compared with less than four of ten secondary participants said the program was effective in meeting their communication needs or at least useful to them even though it was not directly related to their group's more important needs.

While almost all the participants indicated they had at least some personal involvement in the program, the elementary staff members were more likely to indicate a high level of involvement. A larger proportion of the elementary respondents said they had had some input into what the programs would be.

The elementary respondents more frequently said that they had improved their communication skills as a result of the HRP, that communications had improved among the total staff, and that the HRP had improved interpersonal relations in their school.

Although the elementary respondents did not differ greatly from the secondary staff in seeing a direct relationship between the HRP and the desegregation/integration plan, they were much more likely to see the program as potentially helpful to desegregation.

Opinions of the elementary respondents concerning the effects of the program on students were consistently more positive than those of the secondary staff.

While most of the elementary staff said the program had been worthwhile to them, most of the secondary staff said it had not.

About the same proportion of elementary and secondary respondents agreed there was a need for more human relations training in their schools, but the elementary staff members were more likely to voice an interest in further participation in human relations programs. Elementary respondents more frequently said that the program in their school was led by their human relations chairperson while more secondary respondents indicated that a committee member led their program. Since the human relations chairpersons were more highly trained than the other committee members, this may indicate that the elementary programs were actually superior to the secondary programs.

Various other factors could help account for these consistent and pronounced differences between elementary and secondary participants. Differences in size of staff and student enrollment is one such factor. The average fall, 1972 enrollment of the 26 secondary schools was 1,142 students compared with an average of 469 in the 66 elementary schools. The average number of staff members--including teachers, administrators and supportive personnel--for the secondary schools was 110 and the average for the elementary schools was 40. The larger secondary schools may have been less successful in training committee members, implementing the plan, and carrying out the program in the given amount of time because of problems involved in reaching, involving, and coordinating the activities of larger numbers of people.

Another factor is the departmentalized structure of the more subject matter oriented secondary schools, where there is less interdependence among personnel, possibly resulting in more communication barriers. On the other hand, some elementary programs, such as team teaching, ungraded primaries, and tracking, (homogeneous grouping by ability) may promote interdependence among staff at different grade levels.

A third factor to consider is that the secondary schools affected by the desegregation plan were faced with the scheduled changes in their enrollments in the fall of 1973, but the elementary schools will not be affected until the following year. The process of desegregation/integration may have seemed less like a threat to the elementary respondents who had an extra year to prepare and take part in human relations training.

A fourth possibility is suggested by the research of Sedlacek and Brooks.[1] They suggest that attitudes about interacting with blacks depend on the sex of the respondent and the context in which the question is asked. Since 82% of the elementary certificated staff, but less than 40% of the secondary certificated staff, is female, the more positive attitudes of the elementary staff (at least with reference to the desegregation issue) may be attributable to a sex difference.

In light of these extreme differences found between the elementary and the secondary staff, it would likely be more informative if results of future studies were broken down by school level and sex.

---

[1] Sedlacek, W. E., and Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring Racial Attitudes of White Males and Females. Paper presented at National Council on Measurement in Education Convention, New Orleans, February 28, 1973.

Results for Desegregating Schools[1] and All Other Schools

The Desegregation/Integration Plan ultimately involves relatively major transfers of student enrollment for some schools (the "desegregating schools") while leaving the composition of the student body at other schools relatively unchanged. The changes in the secondary schools were scheduled to begin in the 1973-74 school year. The elementary schools would not be affected until the following year. Thirty-two percent of all respondents were from desegregating schools--24% were elementary and 8% were secondary staff members. Sixty-eight percent of the sample were from non-desegregating schools--28% from elementary schools and 39% from secondary schools.

This section examines the differences in questionnaire response of the desegregating schools and all other schools at the elementary and secondary levels. Generally, the participants from the desegregating schools held less positive attitudes toward the HRP than did the participants from non-desegregating schools. The differences between the desegregating staff and the rest of the staff were more pronounced at the secondary level. It should be noted, however, that three of the five desegregating secondary schools used alternate human relations programs which did not necessarily focus entirely on developing communication skills.

Inspection of tables 13-18 shows that although the opinions of the non-desegregating staff toward the program were generally more positive than those of the desegregating staff, the differences between the elementary and secondary staff were so pronounced that desegregating elementary staff members were still more favorable toward the program than were non-desegregating secondary staff members.

Program Objectives

At the elementary level, there was no difference between the desegregating schools' staffs and other staffs concerning their awareness of the goals of the HRP. Sixty-eight percent of the desegregating and 69% of the non-desegregating elementary staff said they had a clear idea of the purpose of the

---

[1] Anthony Jr., Bancroft, Bethune, Bremer, Bryant Jr., Bryn Mawr, Cleveland, Clinton, Corcoran, Douglas, Emerson, Field, Fuller, Greeley, Hall, Harrison, Hay, Irving, Jefferson Jr., Jordan Jr., Kenwood, Loring, Lowell, Madison, Mann, McKinley, Northrop, Penn, Ramsey Jr., Sheridan E., Standish, Webster, Willard, Whittier

program. At the secondary level, however, 42% of the desegregating staff said they had a clear idea of the goals compared with over half (55%) of the rest of the staff.

The desegregating and non-desegregating elementary schools did not differ in their belief that the most important communication needs had been identified for their school. Sixty-two percent of the desegregating participants and 64% of the rest of the staff said they had. At the secondary level, however, only one-third (34%) of the desegregating staff compared with almost half (45%) of the rest of the staff thought the most important needs had been identified.

Staff from desegregating elementary schools were slightly more likely than the non-desegregating elementary staff to think the HRP was related to the communication needs of their school, but they were less likely to think the program had been effective in meeting those needs. Seventy-nine percent of the desegregating and 73% of the non-desegregating elementary staff thought the program was related to their school's needs, but only 39% of the elementary desegregating staff compared with 45% of the non-desegregating staff thought the program had been effective in meeting those needs; 40% of the desegregating, but only 28% of the non-desegregating elementary staff said that although the program was need-related it had not been effective. A smaller proportion of the desegregating (14%) than the non-desegregating elementary staff (20%) found the program useful even though it was not need-related. Fifty-three percent of the elementary desegregating staff compared with 65% of the non-desegregating staff said the program was either effective in meeting their communication needs or otherwise useful to them.

At the secondary level, a smaller proportion of respondents from desegregating schools than from non-desegregating schools found the program to be related to their needs or effective in meeting them. Twenty-seven percent of the secondary desegregating staff compared with 19% of the rest of the staff found the program neither need-related nor useful. Twenty-eight percent of the desegregating staff compared with 40% of the non-desegregating staff said their program was either effective in meeting their needs or generally useful to them. See Table 13 on page 26.

Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

When respondents were asked to indicate how involved they had been in the HRP, no difference in amount of involvement between the desegregating

Table 13. Program Objectives

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent N=960[1]	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent N=1128[2]	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent N=328[3]	SECONDARY All Others Percent N=1504[4]
Did you have a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the Human Relations Program?	Yes	68%	69%	42%	55%
	No	32	31	58	45
Do you think that the communication needs identified by your school or group were the more important communication needs of your school or group?	Yes	62	64	34	45
	No	18	13	39	24
	Not sure what needs were identified	20	24	27	31
Was the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the communication needs of your school or group?	Related to our needs and effective in meeting them	39	45	10	22
	Related to our needs, but not effective in meeting them	40	28	45	41
	Not related to our needs, but useful	14	20	18	18
	Not related to our needs and not useful	7	7	27	19

1. The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 857.
2. " " " " " " " " " " " 987.
3. " " " " " " " " " " " 299.
4. " " " " " " " " " " " 1368.

staff and the rest of the staff at the elementary level was found. There was only a slight difference favoring the non-desegregating staff at the secondary level. When respondents rated the involvement of various groups in their programs, only three noteworthy differences emerged between the desegregating staff and the rest of the staff. The non-desegregating elementary respondents rated the certificated staff as slightly more highly involved than did the desegregating elementary respondents. Eighty-seven percent of the non-desegregating staff rated the certificated staff's involvement as either "much" or "tremendous" compared to 81% of the desegregating staff. Similarly, the non-desegregating elementary staff rated the administrators' level of involvement higher than did the desegregating staff (75% and 64% respectively). At the secondary level, however, the desegregating respondents rated administrators' level of involvement higher than did the non-desegregating staff. Sixty-three percent of the desegregating staff compared with 53% of the rest of the secondary staff rated administrator involvement as "much" or "tremendous."

At the elementary level, the HRP was more likely to be led by the human relations chairperson in the non-desegregating schools than in the desegregating schools, but at the secondary level the human relations chairperson more frequently led the program in the desegregating schools.

At the elementary level, the non-desegregating participants were slightly more likely to feel they had some input into the program than were the desegregating participants. See Table 14 on pages 28 and 29.

Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

Opinions about the effects of the program on communications and interpersonal relationships were consistently more positive among non-desegregating staffs at both the elementary and secondary levels. A larger proportion of the non-desegregating staff felt they had improved their interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP. At both levels, a larger proportion of the non-desegregating staff than the desegregating staff felt communications had improved among their total staff, among teachers, between teachers and administrators, between staff and students, and between certificated and civil service personnel. The one exception to this pattern was that at the secondary level, the desegregating respondents were slightly more likely to feel communications had improved between the school and community than were the non-desegregating participants (14% and 9% respectively).

Table 14. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent N=960[1]	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent N=1128[2]	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent N=328[3]	SECONDARY All Others Percent N=1504[4]
How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your Human Relations Program?					
Clerical staff	None	3 %	3%	3 %	5 %
	Some	42	40	57	57
	Much	44	43	28	28
	Tremendous	8	10	4	3
	Don't Know	4	3	8	7
Custodial staff	None	13	18	14	17
	Some	55	54	60	58
	Much	23	20	13	14
	Tremendous	4	4	3	2
	Don't Know	5	4	10	9
Certificated staff	None	1	1	-	2
	Some	15	11	28	26
	Much	54	57	54	53
	Tremendous	27	30	11	16
	Don't Know	3	2	6	3
Teacher Aides	None	4	6	2	6
	Some	39	38	51	48
	Much	42	42	33	29
	Tremendous	12	12	5	5
	Don't Know	3	2	9	12
Administrators	None	4	2	2	6
	Some	28	22	29	34
	Much	44	51	52	42
	Tremendous	20	24	11	11
	Don't Know	5	2	7	8
Students	None	25	22	27	26
	Some	55	56	56	60
	Much	9	12	5	6
	Tremendous	2	3	2	1
	Don't Know	9	7	10	7

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 857.
2 " " " " " " " " " " " 987.
3 " " " " " " " " " " " 299.
4 " " " " " " " " " " " 1368.

Table 14. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP (continued)

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent N=960[1]	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent N=1128[2]	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent N=328[3]	SECONDARY All Others Percent N=1504[4]
Community	None	34%	25%	34%	37%
	Some	44	55	41	43
	Much	7	6	4	2
	Tremendous	1	2	1	-
	Don't Know	14	12	20	17
Yourself	None	1	1	3	3
	Some	28	30	45	41
	Much	48	51	39	41
	Tremendous	21	18	11	14
	Don't Know	1	-	2	2
Who most often led the Human Relations Programs for your school or group?	Human relations chairperson	60	74	41	35
	Human relations committee member	37	21	50	55
	Don't Know	1	2	6	6
	Other	2	3	3	5
I had some input into what the Tuesday Human Relations Programs would be	Agree	66	71	56	57
	Disagree	34	29	44	43

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 857.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 987.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 299.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 1368.

In elementary and secondary schools, a higher percentage of the non-desegregating participants agreed that the members of their school had developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP. See Table 15 on page 31 and 32.

Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

In elementary and secondary schools alike, the desegregating school participants were slightly more likely to view their programs as related to desegregation than were the non-desegregating school participants.

The desegregating staff members did not differ from the rest of the staff members in their views about the climate for desegregation in their schools. About 45% of both groups at the elementary level agreed, and about 28% of both groups at the secondary level agreed that the climate was more conducive to desegregation as a result of the HRP.

About one-third of elementary school respondents and one-fifth of secondary school respondents felt that the HRP would help them implement the desegregation plan in their schools. Only minor differences were noted between desegregating and non-desegregating respondents on this question. See Table 16 on page 33.

Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

At elementary and secondary levels alike, the desegregating staff members were less likely than the non-desegregating staff to agree that the Human Relations Day was a success, that they learned some things from the program that would enable them to create better learning environments, and that they were doing anything differently in working with students as a result of the HRP. See Table 17 on page 33.

Perceived Value of the Program

Both the elementary and secondary non-desegregating staffs rated the program as generally more worthwhile than did the desegregating respondents. It may be that the desegregating respondents, faced with immediate changes in the coming year, had a more difficult time relating the task of developing communication skills to the issue of desegregation, and they may have been searching instead for such tools as techniques to deal with disruptive behavior or information about minority group cultures.

Table 15. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Inter-personal Relationships

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent N=960[1]	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent N=1128[2]	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent N=328[3]	SECONDARY All Others Percent N=1504[4]
I feel that I improved my inter-personal communication skills as a result of the HRP	Agree	68%	72%	45%	53%
	Disagree	32	28	55	47
Did communications improve in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program?					
The total staff	Yes, Improved	47	56	29	37
	No, Did Not Improve	24	17	40	28
	No, But Needed No Improvement	3	8	3	4
	Don't Know	26	20	29	31
Among teachers	Yes, Improved	50	55	27	45
	No, Did Not Improve	21	15	39	25
	No, But Needed No Improvement	5	10	5	6
	Don't Know	24	20	29	25
Between teachers and administrators	Yes, Improved	31	39	21	27
	No, Did Not Improve	28	20	36	35
	No, But Needed No Improvement	8	12	9	6
	Don't Know	33	29	34	32
Between staff and students	Yes, Improved	38	39	19	26
	No, Did Not Improve	18	17	39	34
	No, But Needed No Improvement	5	6	3	4
	Don't Know	39	38	39	35
Between certificated and civil service personnel	Yes, Improved	42	46	32	39
	No, Did Not Improve	20	14	31	25
	No, But Needed No Improvement	10	15	7	8
	Don't Know	28	24	30	28

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 857.

2 " " " " " " " " " " 987.

3 " " " " " " " " " " 299.

4 " " " " " " " " " " 1368.

Table 15. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Inter-personal Relationships (continued)

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent N=960[1]	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent N=1128[2]	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent N=328[3]	SECONDARY All Others Percent N=1504[4]
School and community	Yes, Improved	20%	27%	14%	9%
	No, Did Not Improve	28	21	38	37
	No, But Needed No Improvement	2	3	2	3
	Don't Know	50	49	47	51
Overall, what impact did the human relations program have on interpersonal relations in your school or group?	Improved greatly	6	9	3	4
	Improved some	67	66	52	60
	Did not improve	17	14	32	25
	Became worse	6	3	10	7
	No improvement was needed	4	8	3	3
The members of my school or group developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP	Agree	53	65	31	43
	Disagree	47	35	69	57

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 857.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 987.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 299.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 1368.

Table 16. Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent N=960[1]	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent N=1128[2]	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent N=328[3]	SECONDARY All Others Percent N=1504[4]
Was the purpose of the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the desegregation-integration plans of the Minneapolis Public Schools?	Yes, directly related to desegregation	22%	17%	22%	15%
	Possibly, but the relationship was not clear	60	60	63	59
	No, not related to desegregation	18	23	15	26
Will the Human Relations Program help your staff implement the desegregation-integration plan in your school or group?	Yes	35	32	22	18
	No, programs not relevant to desegregation	19	18	24	24
	No, did not learn anything related to desegregation	12	13	22	23
	Don't Know	35	37	33	34
The climate within my school or group is more conducive to desegregation-integration as a result of the HRP	Agree	44	45	28	28
	Disagree	56	55	72	72

Table 17. Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent	SECONDARY All Others Percent
The Human Relations day on April 10 was a success	Agree	88%	91%	43%	56%
	Disagree	12	9	57	44
I learned some things from the HRP that will enable me to create better learning environments	Agree	75	81	48	60
	Disagree	25	19	52	40
I am now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP	Agree	48	55	30	36
	Disagree	52	45	70	64

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 857.
2 " " " " " " " " " " 987.
3 " " " " " " " " " " 299.
4 " " " " " " " " " " 1368.

At the elementary level, a larger proportion of the desegregating than the non-desegregating participants voiced a need for further human relations training in their schools. The two groups did not differ at the secondary level.

Although there was no difference at the elementary level, slightly more secondary desegregating respondents voiced an interest in participating in further human relations training programs.

Elementary non-desegregating respondents and secondary desegregating respondents more frequently said their school had made some plans as a result of the HRP. See Table 18 on page 35.

Table 18. Perceived Value of the Program

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Desegregating Percent N=960[1]	ELEMENTARY All Others Percent N=1128[2]	SECONDARY Desegregating Percent N=328[3]	SECONDARY All Others Percent N=1504[4]
67. All in all, how worthwhile was the Tuesday Human Relations Program to you?	Very worthwhile	11%	13%	5%	6%
	Worthwhile	51	55	28	38
	Not very worthwhile	32	28	52	43
	Worthless	6	4	15	13
25. There is a need for more human relations training within my school or group	Agree	67	61	61	61
	Disagree	33	39	39	39
26. I am interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning	Agree	50	50	44	41
	Disagree	50	50	56	59
29. Our school or group has made some plans as a result of the HRP	Agree	46	51	37	31
	Disagree	54	49	63	69

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 857.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 987.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 299.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 1368.

Summary

The Desegregation/Integration Plan involves relatively major transfers of student enrollment for some schools (the "desegregating schools") while leaving the composition of the student body relatively unchanged at others.

Generally, the respondents from the desegregating schools held less positive attitudes toward the HRP than did the respondents from non-desegregating schools. The differences between the desegregating staff and the non-desegregating staff were more pronounced at the secondary level. For example, although there was no difference between the desegregating staff and the rest of the staff at the elementary level, at the secondary level, a smaller proportion of the desegregating staff compared with staff from non-desegregating schools said they had a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the program. Similarly, fewer of the secondary desegregating staff said they thought the most important communication needs of their school had been identified. Although the elementary desegregating staff was slightly more likely than the rest of the elementary staff to think the HRP was related to their school's communication needs, they were less likely to think the program had been effective in meeting those needs. At the secondary level, a smaller proportion of respondents from desegregating schools compared with the rest of the staff found the program to be related to their needs or effective in meeting them, or useful.

The non-desegregating elementary staff rated the certificated staff and the administrators as more highly involved in the program than did the desegregating staff. However, at the secondary level, the desegregating respondents rated administrators' level of involvement higher than did the non-desegregating staff. At the elementary level, the program was more likely to be led by the human relations chairperson in the non-desegregating schools, but at the secondary level, the human relations chairperson more frequently led the program in the desegregating schools. The non-desegregating elementary staff more frequently said they had some input into the program.

Opinions concerning the effects of the program on communications and interpersonal relationships were consistently more positive among non-desegregating staffs at both the elementary and secondary levels.

In elementary and secondary schools alike, the desegregating participants were slightly more likely to view their programs as related to desegregation.

At both the elementary and the secondary levels, the non-desegregating respondents were more positive concerning the favorableness of the program's impact on students.

Both the elementary and secondary non-desegregating staffs rated the program as more worthwhile then did the desegregating respondents. More of the elementary desegregating respondents voiced a need for further human relations training in their schools. Slightly more secondary desegregating respondents voiced an interest in participating in further human relations training programs. This could indicate that teachers dealing with older children and adolescents might see desegregating as potentially more disruptive than teachers dealing with children in the elementary grades. In addition, actual, full scale physical desegregation would affect the junior high staffs soonest, in the fall of 1973. Enrollments in the desegregating elementary schools would not be affected until the 1974 school year. Elementary non-desegregating and secondary desegregating respondents more frequently said their school had made some plans as a result of the HRP.

It should be noted in accounting for these differences between the desegregating and the non-desegregating staff that the desegregating schools had been exposed to more supplementary programs than had the rest of the schools. Eighteen of the 34 desegregating schools were also Title I schools, and 11 of them had been involved in previous human relations training programs (Projects 822 and 934). These staffs, then, may have felt a little less impressed or perhaps a little more burdened by this new program. In addition, the non-desegregating school staffs, which were not immediately faced with a pending change, may have felt less pressured by the ultimate implications of desegregation and thereby may have been freer to concentrate on the activities related to improving communication skills and inter-personal relations for their intrinsic value.

Results by Area

A major reorganization of the Minneapolis public school system was scheduled to occur in the 1973-74 school year. The traditional elementary/secondary structure of the district was replaced by forming three relatively autonomous sub-districts called "areas" and a mini-district called the Southeast Alternatives, a federally funded experimental education project. The purpose of the decentralization plan was to ease the implementation of the city's desegregation/integration plan and to move the decision making closer to the students, faculty, and community. The three major areas are about equal in student population and in minority enrollment.

Although the HRP took place prior to the decentralization of the district, staff opinions concerning the HRP were analyzed separately for each of these areas (North Area, East Area, West Area, and Southeast Alternatives) so the results would be available to the area staffs for planning purposes.

As was the case for the comparison between desegregating and non-desegregating schools, any differences found among the four areas of the city were far outweighed by the differences between the elementary and secondary schools. Thus the least positive response from elementary school staffs in any area of the city was still more positive than the most positive response from secondary school staffs in any area--on any particular question.

Generally, results show slightly more variation among areas at the secondary level than at the elementary level. No consistent pattern of response was noted among the North, East, and West Areas. The SEA staff was frequently the most positive at the elementary level and the least positive at the secondary level.[1] It should be noted that all results for SEA are based on a much smaller number of respondents, about one-tenth as many as each of the other areas.

Program Objectives

A larger proportion of the elementary staff for the SEA (80%) than for any other area said they had a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the HRP. The lowest proportion indicating awareness of program goals at the elementary level was 64% for the North Area. However, at the secondary level, SEA

[1] SEA secondary respondents were all from one school, Marshall-University, which was one of the schools which chose to pursue an alternate program not necessarily devoted to developing communication skills. The SEA Free School serves grades K-12, so results could not be broken according to elementary and secondary level and are therefore not included in this analysis.

appeared to be least informed with only 48% having a clear idea of program goals, while the North and East were high with 55% and 56% respectively.

Elementary respondents from the West, with 67% agreement, were most likely to feel that the communication needs identified by their school were the more important needs. At the secondary level, more respondents from SEA (51%) thought the more important needs had been identified.

When asked if the HRP in their school was related to their needs, answers for the four areas at the elementary level varied only slightly, but there was considerable variability in response at the secondary level. Twenty-six percent of the secondary respondents from the North Area thought the program was related to their needs and effective in meeting them compared with only 7% of the respondents from SEA. About three-fourths of the SEA respondents said the program was related to their needs, but it had not been effective in meeting them. Only 18% of the SEA secondary staff compared to 35%, 38% and 43% of the West, East and North staffs said the program was effective or at least useful. About one-fourth of the respondents from the West Area compared to only 9% from SEA said the program was neither need-related nor useful. See Table 19 on page 40.

Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

When asked to rate their own level of involvement in the HRP, the elementary respondents from the East Area rated their involvement highest. Over three-fourths of them rated their level of involvement as "much" or "tremendous." Sixty-eight percent of the SEA respondents, 67% of the North respondents, and 65% of the West respondents rated themselves as this highly involved. There was little variation at the secondary level. North Area respondents had the highest proportion (55%) rating themselves as highly involved. The corresponding percentages for East, West, and SEA were 54%, 51%, and 51% respectively.

At elementary and secondary levels alike, the respondents from SEA viewed the clerical staff as more highly involved than did respondents from other areas. Sixty-one percent of the SEA elementary respondents compared with 47% of the West Area respondents said the clerical staff was highly involved. At the secondary level, 37% of the SEA staff compared with 30% of the North Area participants said the clerical staff was highly involved.

Table 19. Program Objectives

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY				SECONDARY			
		Percent				Percent			
		N N657[1]	E N690[2]	W N618[3]	SE N107[4]	N N652[5]	E N525[6]	W N662[7]	SE N58[8]
Did you have a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the Human Relations Program?	Yes	64%	70%	70%	80%	55%	56%	50%	48%
	No	36	30	30	20	45	44	50	52
Do you think that the communication needs identified by your school or group were the more important communication needs of your school or group?	Yes	61	60	67	64	46	43	40	51
	No	15	16	14	12	24	27	30	12
	Not sure what needs were identified	24	24	19	24	31	29	30	37
Was the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the communication needs of your school or group?	Related to our needs and effective in meeting them	39	43	44	41	26	20	16	7
	Related to our needs, but not effective in meeting them	35	30	35	33	36	46	41	74
	Not related to our needs, but useful	18	20	16	20	17	18	19	11
	Not related to our needs and not useful	8	6	6	6	21	17	24	9

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

The SEA participants also saw the custodial staff as more highly involved than did the other areas. SEA more frequently rated the custodial staff's involvement as high ("much" or "tremendous") and less frequently rated their involvement as "none."

At the elementary level, SEA respondents also rated the rest of the staff (certificated staff, teacher aides, and administrators) as more highly involved than did the other three areas. However, at the secondary level, the SEA respondents rated these groups as less highly involved than did any of the other areas. The North Area rated the teacher aides as more highly involved than did the other three areas, and the North and West Areas rated the administrators as more highly involved than did the other areas.

Students and the community were not seen as very highly involved at either the elementary or secondary level in any of the areas.

At the elementary level, the HRP was most frequently led by the human relations chairperson in all four areas. However, at the secondary level, the program was most frequently led by a human relations committee member in the East Area, the East Area, and SEA. Some person other than the human relations chairperson or a committee member was also more frequently mentioned as a leader in SEA than in other areas.

At the elementary level there was little variability among areas concerning felt input to the program. The range was from 72% of the SEA respondents who felt they had had some input into their program to the low of 67% of the East respondents. However, at the secondary level there was a big difference in felt input between SEA and the rest of the respondents. Eighty-eight percent of the SEA respondents said they had some input compared to 55%, 57%, and 58% for the North, East, and West respectively. See Table 20 on pages 42 and 43.

Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

At the elementary level, responses varied slightly across areas when participants were asked if they felt they had improved their interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP. Seventy-four percent of the SEA staff, 72% of the West staff, 71% of the East staff, and 70% of the North staff agreed they had. However, big differences existed at the secondary level. Sixty percent of the East Area participants said their

Table 20. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent N N657[1]	E N690[2]	W N618[3]	SE N107[4]	SECONDARY Percent N N652[5]	E N525[6]	W N662[7]	SE N58[8]
How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your Human Relations Program?									
Clerical	None	3%	2%	4%	3%	4%	6%	4%	2%
	Some	41	39	45	36	57	57	57	49
	Much	45	45	39	42	26	30	28	37
	Tremendous	8	11	8	19	4	3	3	0
	Don't Know	3	4	4	0	9	4	8	12
Custodial staff	None	16	17	14	4	16	17	19	9
	Some	48	57	60	63	57	60	57	64
	Much	27	17	19	25	15	16	12	19
	Tremendous	4	4	3	7	2	1	2	0
	Don't Know	4	5	3	2	11	6	10	9
Certificated staff	None	-	-	1	2	1	1	2	2
	Some	14	12	14	7	28	25	25	29
	Much	58	52	55	58	49	57	55	62
	Tremendous	26	33	29	32	17	14	13	5
	Don't Know	2	3	2	1	5	2	5	2
Teacher Aides	None	4	4	8	2	3	8	5	3
	Some	42	40	35	30	47	44	53	60
	Much	40	43	40	50	36	28	26	28
	Tremendous	11	11	14	16	7	5	4	0
	Don't Know	3	3	3	1	8	15	12	9
Administrators	None	3	1	4	3	3	6	5	5
	Some	26	22	26	16	29	40	29	56
	Much	48	47	47	51	46	38	48	28
	Tremendous	19	27	20	29	14	8	11	2
	Don't Know	4	4	2	1	8	7	7	9

(continued)

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

Table 20. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP (continued)

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent N N657[1]	E N690[2]	W N618[3]	SE N107[4]	SECONDARY Percent N N652[5]	E N525[6]	W N662[7]	SE N58[8]
Students	None	26%	22%	21%	29%	22%	34%	25%	16%
	Some	51	57	59	54	63	54	57	76
	Much	11	10	10	8	6	4	7	7
	Tremendous	3	2	3	2	1	2	1	0
	Don't Know	9	8	7	8	7	7	10	2
Community	None	37	27	23	16	37	42	35	16
	Some	41	50	59	67	41	40	41	75
	Much	4	9	6	8	4	2	3	0
	Tremendous	1	1	2	2	-	-	1	0
	Don't Know	16	14	10	7	18	16	19	9
Yourself	None	1	1	1	2	2	2	4	2
	Some	31	23	32	30	41	42	42	46
	Much	49	53	48	44	40	41	39	46
	Tremendous	18	23	17	24	15	13	12	5
	Don't Know	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	2
Who most often led the Human Relations Programs for your school or group?	Human relations chairperson	66	65	71	53	48	28	37	26
	Human relations committee member	28	31	26	38	44	59	55	58
	Don't know	1	2	1	4	6	6	5	4
	Other	4	2	1	5	3	7	3	12
I had some input into what the Tuesday Human Relations Programs would be	Agree	68	67	71	72	55	57	58	88
	Disagree	32	33	29	28	45	43	42	12

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

interpersonal communication skills had improved, but only 28% of the SEA participants endorsed this statement. The North and West Areas showed about 50% agreement.

Respondents were asked whether communications had improved between various groups in their school as a result of the HRP. The SEA elementary participants were more likely than the other areas' participants to say that no improvement was needed, but SEA secondary participants were least likely to say there was no improvement needed.

At the elementary level, more SEA participants (57%) than other areas' participants thought communication had improved among the total staff. Improvement was seen by fewer West participants, where 51% said communication had improved and 22% said communication did not improve. At the secondary level more participants from the East thought communication had improved among the total staff. Fewest SEA participants saw improvement. Thirty-nine percent of the SEA respondents said communication had not improved.

At the elementary level, more of the West participants (57%) than participants from other areas thought communication had improved among teachers. At the secondary level more East Area participants (49%) thought communication had improved among teachers, and fewest SEA participants saw the improvement. Only 32% of them said communication had improved and 44% said it hadn't.

The most positive improvement in communication between teachers and administrators was voiced by the SEA elementary staff. Forty-one percent said things had improved and only 9% said they hadn't. However, at the secondary level, over two-thirds (67%) of the SEA participants said communication had not improved between teachers and administrators, and only 11% said it had. Most improvement here was seen by the North with 29% saying communication had improved.

At the elementary level, improved communication between staff and students was most frequently noted by the East and West Area staffs (40%), and at the secondary level by the North and East staffs. SEA saw the least improvement here with 46% of the secondary staff saying communication had not improved and only 21% saying it had.

Forty-three percent of the East respondents but only 32% of the West respondents thought communication had improved between the certificated staff and civil service personnel at the secondary level. Little variability among areas at the elementary level occurred.

Only sixteen percent of the elementary staff from the North Area, compared to 31% from SEA thought communication had improved between the school and the community. At the secondary level, 57% of the SEA staff, 39% of the North staff, 37% of the East staff, and 36% of the West staff said things had not improved.

About three-fourths of the elementary staff in each of the four areas thought the HRP had improved interpersonal relations in their school. While 70% of the secondary staff from the East Area thought the overall impact of the program was to improve interpersonal relations, only 47% of the secondary staff from SEA agreed that relations had improved, and almost half of them disagreed that the program had improved things.

Seventy-two percent of the SEA elementary staff, but only 57% of the East elementary staff said the members of their school developed a greater togetherness as a result of the program. At the secondary level, 45% of the East staff but only 18% of the SEA staff thought that the program had resulted in greater togetherness. Eighty-two percent of the SEA staff disagreed that this had resulted. See Table 21 on page 46 and 47.

Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Most of the respondents in all areas thought the program in their school was directly or at least possibly related to the desegregation/integration plans. The usual differences in response between the elementary and the secondary level were not so pronounced on this question. Eighty-one percent of the North elementary staff and the West secondary staff thought the purpose of their programs was related to desegregation. The biggest difference was between the secondary SEA staff, where only 63% saw a relationship, and the other areas. Thirty-seven percent of the SEA secondary staff said their programs were not related to the desegregation/integration plan.

Respondents were asked if the HRP would help their staff implement the desegregation/integration plan. SEA respondents were more likely to say "no" at both the elementary and the secondary levels than were respondents from the other three areas. Forty-two percent of the SEA elementary participants and 65% of the secondary participants said either that the program was not relevant to desegregation or that they did not learn anything relevant to desegregation.

Table 21. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Inter-personal Relationship

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent N N657[1]	E N690[2]	W N618[3]	SE N107[4]	SECONDARY Percent N N652[5]	E N525[6]	W N662[7]	SE N58[8]
I feel that I improved my interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP	Agree	70%	71%	72%	74%	50%	60%	49%	28%
	Disagree	30	29	28	26	50	40	51	72
Did communications improve in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program?									
The total staff	Yes, Improved	52	51	51	57	37	39	31	26
	No, Did Not Improve	19	17	22	14	29	27	35	39
	No, But Needed No Improvement	4	8	5	9	5	2	4	0
	Don't Know	25	23	21	20	29	32	30	35
Among teachers	Yes, Improved	51	50	57	52	43	49	35	32
	No, Did Not Improve	16	18	20	11	25	24	31	44
	No, But Needed No Improvement	7	10	6	11	7	5	5	0
	Don't Know	26	22	17	26	25	22	29	25
Between teachers and administrators	Yes, Improved	35	34	36	41	29	24	26	11
	No, Did Not Improve	21	21	28	9	33	38	33	67
	No, But Needed No Improvement	9	13	8	18	7	5	8	0
	Don't Know	34	32	27	33	31	33	34	23
Between staff and students	Yes, Improved	37	40	40	34	27	26	23	21
	No, Did Not Improve	17	16	18	20	36	36	33	46
	No, But Needed No Improvement	4	7	5	9	4	4	5	0
	Don't Know	42	36	37	36	34	34	40	33

(continued)

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

Table 21. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Inter-personal Relationships (continued)

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent N	E	W	SE	SECONDARY Percent N	E	W	SE
		N657[1]	N690[2]	N618[3]	N107[4]	N652[5]	N525[6]	N662[7]	N58[8]
Between certificated and civil service personnel	Yes, Improved	43%	46%	44%	45%	40%	43%	32%	39%
	No, Did Not Improve	16	17	15	18	28	20	28	28
	No, But Needed No Improvement	14	13	12	16	7	8	10	4
	Don't Know	26	25	28	21	25	29	30	30
School and community	Yes, Improved	16	26	30	31	12	7	11	3
	No, Did Not Improve	27	21	21	19	39	37	36	57
	No, But Needed No Improvement	2	4	2	9	3	3	2	0
	Don't Know	54	50	47	41	46	53	51	40
Overall, what impact did the human relations program have on inter-personal relations in your school or group?	Improved greatly	7	7	8	10	6	4	3	0
	Improved some	68	66	68	69	56	66	56	47
	Did not improve	15	16	14	11	27	22	28	49
	Became worse	5	4	4	1	7	5	11	4
	No improvement was needed	5	8	6	10	4	3	3	0
The members of my school or group developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP	Agree	61	57	59	72	43	45	39	18
	Disagree	39	43	41	28	57	54	61	82

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

SEA elementary respondents more frequently (49%) than other area respondents said the climate within their school was more conducive to desegregation/integration as a result of the HRP. However, at the secondary level the SEA respondents less frequently (20%) than all other area respondents thought this to be true. See Table 22 on page 49.

Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

About nine of ten elementary respondents in each area thought the Human Relations Day had been a success. At the secondary level the SEA respondents were most positive with 64% agreeing that it had been a success in comparison with the West Area where only half thought it had been successful.

More elementary respondents from SEA agreed that they had learned some things that would enable them to create better learning environments, but SEA secondary respondents were the least likely group to endorse this statement.

Fifty-five percent of the West elementary respondents compared with 42% of SEA staff said they were doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP. At the secondary level, 40% of the East staff compared with only 19% of the SEA staff said they were doing things differently as a result of the program. See Table 23 on page 50.

Perceived Value of the Program

SEA elementary staff gave the most positive endorsement of the program. Seventy-one percent said the program was worthwhile or very worthwhile to them compared to 67% of the East and West staff and 62% of the North staff. At the secondary level, the SEA staff was least positive. Only 22% of the SEA staff compared with 52% of the East staff said the program was worthwhile or very worthwhile. Seventy-nine percent of the SEA secondary staff said the program was not very worthwhile or worthless. Thus, the majority of the elementary participants in each area said the program was worthwhile, while the majority of the secondary participants in each area, with the exception of the East Area said they didn't find the program worthwhile.

Between 60% and 65% of the elementary staff in each area said there was a need for more human relations training in their school. At the secondary level, 78% of the SEA staff compared to 57% of the staff in the West Area, 60% in the North and 65% in the East said there was such a need.

Table 22. Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent N N657[1]	E N690[2]	W N618[3]	SE N107[4]	SECONDARY Percent N N652[5]	E N525[6]	W N662[7]	SE N58[8]
Was the purpose of the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the desegregation-integration plans of the Minneapolis Public Schools?	Yes, directly related to desegregation	17%	19%	22%	14%	18%	9%	20%	12%
	Possibly, but the relationship was not clear	64	58	55	64	56	65	61	51
	No, not related to desegregation	19	23	23	22	26	26	18	37
Will the Human Relations Program help your staff implement the desegregation-integration plan in your school or group?	Yes	32	34	35	28	21	16	21	5
	No, programs not relevant to desegregation	17	18	21	21	23	25	22	37
	No, did not learn anything related to desegregation	13	10	12	21	25	22	21	28
	Don't know	38	38	33	30	31	38	36	30
The climate within my school or group is more conducive to desegregation-integration as a result of the HRP	Agree	45	42	44	49	26	28	30	20
	Disagree	55	58	56	51	74	72	70	80

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

Table 23. Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent N N657[1]	E N690[2]	W N618[3]	SE N107[4]	SECONDARY Percent N N652[5]	E N525[6]	W N662[7]	SE N58[8]
The Human Relations day on April 10 was a success	Agree	88%	91%	91%	90%	54%	62%	50%	64%
	Disagree	12	9	9	10	46	38	50	36
I learned some things from the HRP that will enable me to create better learning environments	Agree	78	79	78	85	58	65	55	42
	Disagree	22	21	22	15	42	35	45	58
I am now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP	Agree	50	52	55	42	37	40	31	19
	Disagree	50	48	45	58	63	60	69	81

50

59

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

About half of the elementary respondents in each area said they were interested in further human relations training. At the secondary level, about half of the East Area and SEA staff voiced an interest. The West and North area respondents expressed less interest in further training with only 37% and 43%, respectively, agreeing.

At the elementary level more SEA participants said that their school had made some plans as a result of the HRP than did other area's participants. At the secondary level, 40% of the West respondents, 30% of the North, 28% of the East, and 22% of the SEA respondents said their school had made plans as a result of the program. See Table 24 on page 52.

Table 24. Perceived Value of the Program

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent N N657[1]	E N690[2]	W N618[3]	SE N107[4]	SECONDARY Percent N N652[5]	E N525[6]	W N662[7]	SE N58[8]
All in all, how worthwhile was the Tuesday Human Relations Program to you?	Very worthwhile	10%	12%	13%	14%	9%	6%	5%	4%
	Worthwhile	52	55	54	57	33	46	33	18
	Not very worthwhile	32	29	28	26	42	39	50	68
	Worthless	6	4	5	3	16	9	13	11
There is a need for more human relations training within my school or group	Agree	64	60	65	61	60	65	57	78
	Disagree	36	40	35	39	40	35	43	22
I am interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning	Agree	48	51	50	51	43	47	37	50
	Disagree	52	49	50	49	57	53	63	50
Our school or group has made some plans as a result of the HRP	Agree	50	42	52	60	30	28	40	22
	Disagree	50	58	48	40	70	72	60	78

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 589.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 601.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 543.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 94.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 595.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 475.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 605.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 50.

Summary

Responses to the HRP questionnaire from the four newly formed administrative units of the district (North Area, East Area, West Area, and Southeast Alternatives) were compared so that these results would be available to the area staffs for future planning. These results should not be used to assess past efforts at human relations training or desegregation/integration efforts since the HRP took place before the decentralization into these four areas was implemented. Caution should be observed in interpreting results from SEA since this area is so much smaller than the others and because all secondary respondents from this area were from one school which was one of 12 schools which adopted an alternative human relations program, one not necessarily devoted to developing communication skills.

More variation between areas at the secondary level than at the elementary level occurred, although there is no consistent pattern--with the exception that the SEA staff was frequently the most positive at the elementary level and the least positive at the secondary level. While SEA elementary respondents were most likely to say no improvement in communications was needed in their schools, they also saw the program as resulting in improved communications more frequently. On the other hand the SEA secondary respondents less frequently said there was no improvement in communication needed, most frequently said further human relations training was needed, and, in spite of the high proportion of respondents who said they had some input into the program, very few saw any results from it (with the exception of a successful Human Relations Day). In spite of seeing so little benefit from the HRP, the SEA secondary respondents voiced the most interest in further participation. This group was also the least likely to see their program as related to desegregation.

At the secondary level, the respondents from the East Area most frequently indicated favorable results from the program.

Results for Respondents Holding Different Positions

Responses of staff members holding clerical, custodial, administrative, certificated, and teacher aide positions were compared on each question in the questionnaire. Generally, administrative and non-administrative certificated staff members responded more favorably to the HRP at both the elementary and secondary levels than did respondents holding other positions.

Program Objectives

Administrators more frequently than other staff members said they had a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the HRP. Ninety-three percent of the elementary administrative personnel, 70% of the elementary certificated and clerical staffs, 59% of the teacher aides, and 41% of the custodial staff had a clear idea of the goals. At the secondary level, 83% of the administrative staff, 54% of the certificated staff and 53% of the teacher aides, but only 46% of the clerical staff and 36% of the custodial staff said they had a clear idea of the program's prupose. The teacher aides were comparatively more well informed than they were at the elementary level.

Administrators were more likely and custodians were less likely than any other group to think the communication needs identified by their school or group were the more important needs. Custodians said they were not sure what needs were identified more frequently than did the other participants.

Respondents were asked whether their school's program was related to the communication needs of their school or group. Administrators were most likely to say the program was both need-related and effective in meeting those needs, and custodians were most likely to say the program was neither need-related nor useful. The teacher aides were most likely to say the program was related to their needs, but not effective in meeting them. Elementary clerical workers were relatively more likely than secondary clerical workers to find their program both need-related and useful.

Only 32-33% of secondary clerks and custodians found the program effective or useful. All elementary respondents--regardless of position--saw the HRP as effective or useful more frequently than did any secondary group, including administrators. Thus, elementary custodians were more favorable than were secondary administrators--who were the most positive at the secondary level. See Table 25 on page 55.

Table 25. Program Objectives

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86[1]	Custodial N46[2]	Administrative N70[3]	Certificated N1401[4]	Teacher Aides N256[5]	Clerical N114[6]	Custodial N25[7]	Administrative N71[8]	Certificated N1425[9]	Teacher Aides N83[10]
Did you have a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the Human Relations Program?	Yes	70%	41%	93%	70%	59%	46%	36%	83%	54%	53%
	No	30	59	7	30	41	54	64	17	46	47
Do you think that the communication needs identified by your school or group were the more important communication needs of your school or group?	Yes	52	42	74	67	46	42	13	63	44	37
	No	15	11	13	15	15	19	33	23	28	21
	Not sure what needs were identified	33	47	13	17	39	39	54	14	28	43
Was the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the communication needs of your school or group?	Related to our needs and effective in meeting them	46	27	63	41	38	17	8	39	21	20
	Related to our needs, but not effective in meeting them	24	32	22	35	36	40	40	40	42	49
	Not related to our needs, but useful	23	30	15	17	22	16	24	13	17	21
	Not related to our needs and not useful	6	11	0	7	4	26	28	9	20	10

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 66.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 37.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 65.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 1255.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 220.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 89.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 18.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 63.
[9] " " " " " " " " " " " 1327.
[10] " " " " " " " " " " " 70.

Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Respondents were asked how much involvement in the program occurred among the various groups in their school. A tendency for people to see participants in their own job category as more highly involved than did people in other positions was evident. A tendency for administrators to rate the various groups as more highly involved than other respondents also occurred.

Administrators were more likely to rate their own involvement as high ("much" or "tremendous") than were respondents in other groups. Custodians were least likely to rate their own involvement as high.

At both the elementary level and the secondary level, administrators saw the clerical staff as more involved than the clerks thought themselves to be, and certificated staff saw the clerical staff as less involved than the clerks themselves did. At the elementary level 53% of the clerical participants said the clerical staff was highly involved in the program. Three-fourths of the administrators but only half of the certificated staff said the clerical staff was highly involved. At the secondary level 41% of the clerical respondents said the clerical staff had been highly involved, while 46% of the custodians and 45% of the administrators but only 29% of the certificated staff rated the clerical staff as highly involved. This noteworthy difference between administrators and certificated staff concerning rated involvement of the clerical staff could either be taken as evidence of a halo effect on the part of the administrators rating their personal office staffs or could reflect the fact that administrators might be more aware of the clerical staffs' actual level of involvement because they interact with them more frequently than do the certificated staffs. The clerical workers rated the certificated staff and the administrators as more highly involved than they themselves were and the other groups as less highly involved than they were.

At elementary and the secondary levels alike the custodians rated the custodial staff as more highly involved than did any of the other respondents. Fewer of the clerical staff than any of the other groups rated the custodial staff as highly involved. Custodians saw the teacher aides as less involved than the custodial staff was, but they viewed the rest of the staff as more involved than they were. Custodians thought administrators were the most highly involved group.

Administrators saw the administrative staff, closely followed by the certificated staff, as most highly involved and the custodial staff as

least involved. At the elementary level, fewer teacher aides than other respondents rated administrators as highly involved. At the secondary level, the certificated staff was the least likely group to rate administrators as highly involved.

The certificated staff thought they were the most highly involved group and custodians were the least involved. Administrators rated the certificated staff's involvement as higher than did the certificated staff, and custodians rated the certificated staff as highly involved less frequently than did the other groups.

Teacher aides rated themselves as more highly involved than did any of the other groups. At the elementary level, clerical workers least frequently rated teacher aides highly involved and administrators most frequently rated them highly involved. Elementary teacher aides rated the certificated staff as most highly involved (the only group they rated as more highly involved than teacher aides) and the custodial staff as least highly involved. At the secondary level, the teacher aides rated the administrative staff as most highly involved, certificated staff second and themselves third. Again the custodial staff was viewed as least involved.

The teacher aides and the custodial staff were the most likely of the groups to say they didn't know who led the human relations programs in their schools.

At the elementary level, the administrators most frequently (88%) felt they had some input into what the programs would be. The custodians least frequently (52%) said they had input. At the secondary level, the administrators again most frequently (73%) felt they had input into what the programs would be, and the custodial staff least frequently (42%) felt they had input. See Table 26 on pages 58 and 59.

Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

Administrators, more frequently than other participants, said they felt they had improved their interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP. The custodial staff voiced this feeling least frequently. Because comparisons so consistently favor the elementary participants, it is surprising that a larger proportion of secondary teacher aides than elementary teacher aides agreed their communication skills had improved. The secondary teacher aides equalled the secondary administrators in their

Table 26. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86 (1)	Custodial N46 (2)	Administrative N70 (3)	Certificated N1401 (4)	Teacher Aides N256 (5)	Clerical N114 (6)	Custodial N25 (7)	Administrative N71 (8)	Certificated N1425 (9)	Teacher Aides N83 (10)
How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your HRP?	None	0%	0%	3%	4%	4%	6%	0%	4%	5%	9%
	Some	46	40	22	44	34	50	33	48	60	44
	Much	45	44	61	42	42	33	38	41	27	36
Clerical	Tremendous	8	12	14	8	13	8	8	4	2	4
	Don't Know	1	5	0	3	7	3	21	3	6	7
Custodial	None	20	4	13	15	15	22	12	17	18	19
	Some	63	40	52	59	47	54	40	66	59	53
	Much	10	38	28	20	21	11	36	11	14	16
	Tremendous	2	16	6	3	6	1	4	1	1	0
	Don't Know	5	2	1	3	11	11	8	4	9	12
Non-Administrative certificated staff	None	0	0	0	-	1	4	0	1	1	1
	Some	18	21	9	12	13	17	21	21	27	27
	Much	59	53	49	56	51	60	42	56	54	53
	Tremendous	20	16	41	32	25	9	12	20	15	12
	Don't Know	2	9	1	1	9	10	25	1	3	6
Teacher Aides	None	7	0	1	6	2	6	4	6	5	1
	Some	51	43	37	39	30	38	30	49	51	33
	Much	33	38	48	41	48	30	26	35	29	52
	Tremendous	5	7	13	12	16	5	9	7	5	8
	Don't Know	4	12	0	2	5	21	30	3	10	6
Administrative	None	2	0	0	3	3	5	0	1	5	1
	Some	23	12	7	26	23	23	13	17	35	23
	Much	46	54	59	49	39	44	39	58	44	58
	Tremendous	23	27	33	22	24	16	17	23	9	10
	Don't Know	5	7	0	1	12	13	30	1	6	7
Students	None	25	20	23	24	22	25	30	16	27	24
	Some	43	28	59	59	48	50	30	74	61	41
	Much	11	12	13	10	10	4	13	6	6	7
	Tremendous	5	5	1	3	4	1	4	1	1	4
	Don't Know	16	35	3	5	17	20	22	3	5	23
Community	None	17	26	25	30	33	37	33	42	37	38
	Some	51	26	56	54	35	33	24	45	45	25
	Much	5	7	13	6	8	1	10	1	3	6
	Tremendous	1	2	1	1	1	1	5	0	-	0
	Don't Know	26	38	4	10	24	29	29	11	15	31

Continued

Table 26. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP (continued)

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86[1]	Custodial N46[2]	Administrative N70[3]	Certificated N1401[4]	Teacher Aides N256[5]	Clerical N114[6]	Custodial N25[7]	Administrative N71[8]	Certificated N1425[9]	Teacher Aides N83[10]
How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your HRP? (continued)											
Yourself	None	2%	5%	0%	1%	2%	7%	13%	6%	2%	1%
	Some	47	52	10	25	39	51	33	20	42	38
	Much	42	38	61	52	43	35	37	56	41	49
	Tremendous	8	5	29	22	14	6	4	17	14	6
	Don't Know	0	0	0	1	3	1	13	1	1	6
Who most often led the Human Relations Programs for your school or group?	Human relations chairperson	72	64	68	68	59	46	36	49	37	34
	Human relations committee member	24	25	29	28	35	43	44	48	54	48
	Don't Know	1	7	0	1	4	7	16	1	4	10
	Other	4	5	3	3	2	4	4	1	5	9
I had some input into what the Tuesday Human Relations Programs would be	Agree	58	52	88	72	58	46	42	73	59	56
	Disagree	42	48	12	28	42	54	58	27	41	44

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 66.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 37.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " " 65.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " " 1255.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " " 220.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " " 89.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " " 18.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " " 63.
[9] " " " " " " " " " " " " 1327.
[10] " " " " " " " " " " " " 70.

feeling that the program had resulted in improved interpersonal communication skills.

Respondents were asked whether communications had improved among various groups in their school. Administrators were much more likely than any other group to say they had. Three-fourths of the elementary administrators and two-thirds of the secondary administrators said communication among the total staff had improved as a result of the HRP. By comparison, only 26% of secondary custodians said things had improved. At both levels, custodians and teacher aides were the least likely groups to say communication had improved among the total staff. A larger proportion of the certificated staff than of the other groups said communications among the total staff had not improved. Elementary clerical and custodial staff were the most likely to say no improvement was needed.

A larger proportion of administrators than of the other respondents said communications had improved among teachers. The certificated staff was the second most likely group to note this improvement. The certificated staff also was the most likely group to say things had not improved.

Again, administrators were the most likely group to say communication had improved between teachers and administrators, and the certificated staff was most likely to feel communication had improved between staff and students with around half of them saying it had. Over 60% of the administrators, more than for any other group, said communications had improved between certificated and civil service personnel. The clerical staff was the most likely group to say there was no improvement needed. Administrators also saw the most improvement in communication between school and community.

In assessing the overall impact of the HRP on interpersonal relations, administrators were most likely to say things had improved and the least likely to say there was no improvement needed. The custodial staff was the most likely group to say things had not improved or had become worse. At the elementary level a relatively high proportion of clerical staff and custodial staff (14% and 17% respectively) said no improvement was needed.

Administrators had the highest proportion of agreement that the members of their school developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP. At the secondary level, the custodial and certificated staffs were more likely than other groups to disagree that this was the case. See Table 27 on pages 61 and 62.

Table 27. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86[1]	Custodial N46[2]	Administrative N70[3]	Certificated N1401[4]	Teacher Aides N256[5]	Clerical N114[6]	Custodial N25[7]	Administrative N71[8]	Certificated N1425[9]	Teacher Aides N83[10]
I feel that I improved my interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP	Agree	71%	38%	91%	71%	69%	55%	43%	70%	50%	70%
	Disagree	29	62	9	29	31	45	57	30	50	30
Did communications improve in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program?											
The total staff	Yes, Improved	55	48	75	52	46	34	26	66	36	31
	No, Did Not Improve	10	12	10	21	18	29	17	20	32	18
	No, But Needed No Improvement	12	19	3	6	7	3	4	0	4	2
	Don't Know	23	21	12	21	29	35	52	14	29	49
Among teachers	Yes, Improved	35	24	79	59	29	17	14	61	45	28
	No, Did Not Improve	6	11	9	19	17	16	10	16	31	12
	No, But Needed No Improvement	6	18	1	8	8	4	0	3	6	6
	Don't Know	52	47	10	14	47	64	76	20	19	54
Between teachers and administrators	Yes, Improved	25	21	69	37	24	14	17	73	26	15
	No, Did Not Improve	8	5	13	27	12	22	17	16	39	16
	No, But Needed No Improvement	11	13	4	12	8	3	0	0	7	3
	Don't Know	56	61	13	24	57	61	65	11	28	66
Between staff and students	Yes, Improved	29	14	55	41	38	16	14	47	25	27
	No, Did Not Improve	5	22	10	19	15	23	33	23	38	19
	No, But Needed No Improvement	6	5	3	5	6	2	0	3	4	3
	Don't Know	59	59	32	35	41	60	52	27	32	51
Between certificated and civil service personnel	Yes, Improved	46	43	67	44	44	39	38	60	38	44
	No, Did Not Improve	9	18	10	18	16	27	33	14	26	16
	No, But Needed No Improvement	23	20	3	13	13	14	8	6	8	8
	Don't Know	22	18	19	26	27	20	21	20	28	32

(continued)

Table 27. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships (continued)

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86[1]	Custodial N46[2]	Administrative N70[3]	Certificated N1401[4]	Teacher Aides N256[5]	Clerical N114[6]	Custodial N25[7]	Administrative N71[8]	Certificated N1425[9]	Teacher Aides N83[10]
Did communications improve in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program?											
School and community	Yes, Improved	27%	5%	45%	24%	22%	6%	9%	17%	10%	11%
	No, Did Not Improve	7	18	15	26	20	23	26	39	41	26
	No, But Needed No Improvement	4	5	0	2	4	1	0	4	2	3
	Don't Know	62	71	40	48	54	70	65	40	47	60
Overall, what impact did the human relations program have on interpersonal relations in your school or group?	Improved greatly	12	9	21	6	8	4	4	10	4	6
	Improved some	59	46	71	69	60	55	52	72	58	66
	Did not improve	14	26	6	15	13	26	32	14	27	21
	Became worse	1	2	1	4	8	11	12	3	8	1
	No improvement was needed	14	17	1	6	11	5	0	0	3	5
The members of my school or group developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP.	Agree	68	60	84	58	59	46	33	70	39	50
	Disagree	32	40	16	42	41	54	67	30	61	50

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 66.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 37.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 65.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 1255.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 220.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 89.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 18.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 63.
[9] " " " " " " " " " " " 1327.
[10] " " " " " " " " " " " 70.

Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Administrators were the most likely and custodians the least likely to view the HRP as directly related to desegregation. Administrators were most likely to think the program would help their staff implement the desegregation/integration plan. Administrators also were much more likely to agree that the climate within their schools was more conducive to desegregation/integration as a result of the HRP. At the secondary level, teacher aides were considerably more positive on this question than the other groups (except for administrators). See Table 28 on page 64.

Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

All of the elementary administrators and over three-fourths of the secondary administrators thought the Human Relations Day had been a success. With the exception of the custodial staff, at least nine out of 10 elementary staff members in each group thought the Human Relations Day had been successful.

Administrators more frequently said they had learned some things from the program that would help them create better learning environments. Secondary teacher aides were very positive on this question also.

The elementary administrative staff and certificated staff and the secondary administrators more frequently said they were doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP. The custodial staff least frequently concurred. See Table 29 on page 65.

Perceived Value of the Program

Administrators much more frequently said the program was worthwhile or very worthwhile and custodians more frequently said it was not very worthwhile or worthless.

Administrators were most likely to agree that there was a need for more human relations training in their schools and custodians were most likely to disagree. Administrators were most and custodians least likely to voice a desire in participating in further human relations training. Administrators also were most likely to say their schools had made some plans as a result of the HRP. See Table 30 on page 66.

Table 28. Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86[1]	Custodial N46[2]	Administrative N70[3]	Certificated N1401[4]	Teacher Aides N256[5]	Clerical N114[6]	Custodial N25[7]	Administrative N71[8]	Certificated N1425[9]	Teacher Aides N83[10]
Was the purpose of the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the desegregation/integration plans of the Minneapolis Public Schools?	Yes, directly related to desegregation	25%	13%	28%	18%	17%	12%	20%	39%	16%	12%
	Possibly, but the relationship was not clear	61	61	51	61	58	69	44	44	60	68
	No, not related to desegregation	14	26	21	21	24	18	36	17	24	20
Will the Human Relations Program help your staff implement the desegregation/integration plan in your school or group?	Yes	35	17	46	33	33	18	20	44	18	20
	No, programs not relevant to desegregation	12	13	22	20	15	14	24	18	25	22
	No, did not learn anything related to desegregation	15	26	3	11	17	32	36	8	22	16
	Don't Know	38	43	29	36	36	36	20	30	35	43
The climate within my school or group is more conducive to desegregation/integration as a result of the HRP	Agree	48	42	71	42	40	27	23	54	27	41
	Disagree	52	58	29	58	60	73	77	46	73	59

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 66.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " " 37.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " " 65.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " " 1255.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " " 220.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " " 89.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " " 18.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " " 63.
[9] " " " " " " " " " " " " 1327.
[10] " " " " " " " " " " " " 70.

Table 29. Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86[1]	Custodial N46[2]	Administrative N70[3]	Certificated N1401[4]	Teacher Aides N256[5]	Clerical N114[6]	Custodial N257[7]	Administrative N71[8]	Certificated N1425[9]	Teacher Aides N83[10]
The Human Relations day on April 10 was a success	Agree	92%	67%	100%	90%	90%	55%	28%	77%	55%	61%
	Disagree	8	33	0	10	10	45	72	23	45	39
I learned some things from the HRP that will enable me to create better learning environments	Agree	76	41	96	80	80	43	48	77	59	73
	Disagree	24	59	4	20	20	57	52	23	41	27
I am now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP	Agree	31	17	72	56	39	23	19	60	35	38
	Disagree	69	83	28	44	61	77	81	40	65	62

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 66.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 37.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 65.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 1255.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 220.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 89.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 18.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 63.
[9] " " " " " " " " " " " 1327.
[10] " " " " " " " " " " " 70.

Table 30. Perceived Value of the Program

Question	Response	ELEMENTARY Percent					SECONDARY Percent				
		Clerical N86[1]	Custodial N46[2]	Administrative N70[3]	Certificated N1401[4]	Teacher Aides N256[5]	Clerical N114[6]	Custodial N25[7]	Administrative N71[8]	Certificated N1425[9]	Teacher Aides N83[10]
All in all, how worthwhile was the Tuesday Human Relations Program to you?	Very worthwhile	14%	9%	33%	10%	10%	6%	0%	14%	6%	6%
	Worthwhile	51	28	55	55	58	32	24	58	36	40
	Not very worthwile	34	54	10	31	27	47	40	23	45	49
	Worthless	1	9	1	4	5	15	36	6	12	5
There is a need for more human relations training within my school or group	Agree	47	31	88	65	58	45	43	84	62	61
	Disagree	53	69	12	35	42	55	57	16	38	39
I am interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning	Agree	34	19	82	51	48	26	20	70	42	45
	Disagree	66	81	18	49	52	74	80	30	58	55
Our school or group has made some plans as a result of the HRP	Agree	52	42	72	46	54	35	43	55	32	34
	Disagree	48	58	28	54	46	65	57	45	68	66

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 66.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " " 37.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " " 65.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " " 1255.
[5] " " " " " " " " " " " 220.
[6] " " " " " " " " " " " 89.
[7] " " " " " " " " " " " 18.
[8] " " " " " " " " " " " 63.
[9] " " " " " " " " " " " 1327.
[10] " " " " " " " " " " " 70.

Summary

Responses of staff members holding clerical, custodial, administrative, certificated, and teacher aide positions were compared on each question.

Administrative and non-administrative certificated staff members responded more favorably to the HRP at both the elementary and secondary levels than did respondents holding other positions. Custodians were least involved and least positive toward the program. They were also the smallest group of respondents. There were only 46 elementary and 25 secondary custodial respondents. A tendency for people to see participants in their own job category as more highly involved than people in other positions was evident. A tendency for administrators to rate the various groups as more highly involved than other respondents also occurred.

Administrators were also the most likely and custodians were the least likely to see the HRP as directly related to desegregation, and administrators most frequently said the program had positive effects on students.

Administrators most frequently said there was a need for more human relations training in their schools and also most frequently voiced an interest in participating in further human relations training programs.

Results For Schools Which Have Had Previous Human Relations Training[1]

Twenty-two schools had previous human relations training through Project 822 (1970-71) and/or Project 934 (1972-73). Half of these schools were elementary and half were secondary. Two schools, Willard and Folwell, were involved in both previous programs. It was not known what proportion of the people currently employed at these schools had taken part in these earlier programs. Although these earlier programs, particularly 934, may have overlapped some of the content covered in the HRP, there were major differences in the organization and intent of these programs and the HRP. Projects 934 and 822 were voluntary programs for any school having at least 50 minority students, but the HRP was mandatory for all staff members in all schools. Participants in 934 and 822 included a set ratio of students and community members in addition to the interested staff members, and they were all paid for taking part.

There was no consistent and clearcut pattern of differences between responses from schools which had participated in 822 and/or 934 programs and responses citywide.[2] However, there was a slight trend for the respondents from the 934 elementary schools to be more positively oriented toward the HRP than were the respondents from the 822 elementary schools. At the elementary level the 934 respondents were more positive and the 822 respondents were less positive than were respondents citywide. Compared with the elementary respondents, the secondary 822 respondents were more similar to the 934 respondents, and both groups varied less from the city-total results at this level.

Program Objectives

At the elementary level, 71% of the respondents from 934 schools and 62% from 822 schools, compared with 69% citywide, said they had a clear idea of the purpose of the HRP. At the secondary level, a larger proportion of respondents from both the 822 schools (60%) and the 934 schools (57%) than of respondents citywide (53%) said they were familiar with the goals.

---

[1] 822 schools: Field, Folwell Jr., Franklin Jr., Greeley, Harrison, Motley-Pratt, Phillips Jr., Ramsey Jr., Shingle Creek, South, and Willard.
934 schools: Corcoran, Folwell Jr., Hall, Hawthorne, Henry, Jefferson Jr., Lowell, Nokomis Jr., Sheridan Elementary, Sheridan Jr., West, Willard, Work Opportunity Center.

[2] All comparisons are between 822 and/or 934 participants and the citywide totals presented in Tables 1-12. These citywide totals include the 822 and 934 participants.

At the elementary level these groups were less likely than were respondents citywide to think the more important communication needs had been identified. However, at the secondary level, a larger proportion of respondents from both these groups of schools than for the city as a whole thought the more important needs had been identified.

The respondents from the 822 elementary schools were less likely than were the 934 elementary respondents or respondents citywide to think the program had been related to their needs and effective in meeting them. At the secondary level, the respondents from 822 schools were more likely than respondents citywide or 934 respondents to say the program was both need-related and effective. Although there was little variance at the secondary level, at the elementary level, the respondents from 822 schools were less likely than 934 participants (or participants generally) to say the program was effective or useful to them.

Table 31. Program Objectives

Question	Response	934 Percent Elem. N191 [1]	934 Percent Secondary N419 [2]	822 Percent Elem. N288 [3]	822 Percent Secondary N322 [4]
Did you have a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the Human Relations Program	Yes	71%	57%	62%	60%
	No	29	43	38	40
Do you think that the communication needs identified by your school or group were the more important communication needs of your school or group?	Yes	58	46	51	51
	No	17	23	21	27
	Not sure what needs were identified	25	31	28	22
Was the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the communication needs of your school or group?	Related to our needs and effective in meeting them	41	18	27	24
	Related to our needs, but not effective in meeting them	38	42	43	48
	Not related to our needs, but useful	16	21	17	12
	Not related to our needs and not useful	5	19	12	16

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 176.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " 383.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " 258.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " 294.

Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

A smaller proportion of 822 elementary respondents (59%) than 934 (69%) or citywide (70%) elementary respondents said they themselves were highly involved in the program. At the secondary level the 934 respondents rated themselves more highly involved than did the other participants. The proportions for 934, citywide and 822 respondents, respectively, were 56%, 53% and 50%.

Participants from both groups of schools rated the certificated staff slightly less highly involved than did respondents citywide at the elementary level, but at the secondary level, both groups of schools rated their certificated staffs as slightly more highly involved than did respondents citywide. Both groups of schools at both the elementary and the secondary level rated their teacher aides as more highly involved than did respondents generally. There were no noteworthy differences in rated involvement of administrators at either the elementary or the secondary level.

At the elementary level, the human relations chairperson less frequently led the program in the 822 and 934 schools than for the schools as a whole. At the secondary level, the human relations chairperson more frequently led the program in the 822 schools and he less frequently led the program in the 934 schools than in schools generally.

At the elementary level, the 822 respondents less frequently agreed they had some input into what the programs would be than did respondents citywide or in the 934 schools. At the secondary level the 934 respondents less frequently agreed they had some input into the programs. See Table 32 on page 71.

Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

At the elementary level, the 822 respondents less frequently agreed they had improved their interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP and the 934 participants were similar to respondents citywide. At the secondary level, the 934 respondents most frequently agreed their communication skills had improved and the 822 respondents were similar to respondents citywide.

Respondents were asked if communications had improved among various groups in their school. Although there was very little variance at the secondary level, more respondents from the 822 elementary schools said

Table 32. Perceptions of Staff Involvement in the HRP

Question	Response	934 Percent Elem. N191[1]	934 Percent Secondary N419[2]	822 Percent Elem. N288[3]	822 Percent Secondary N322[4]
How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your Human Relations Program?					
Clerical staff	None	2%	7%	2%	8%
	Some	49	61	44	58
	Much	39	24	39	23
	Tremendous	6	-	10	3
	Don't Know	4	7	4	8
Custodial staff	None	18	30	6	23
	Some	56	48	55	56
	Much	18	12	29	7
	Tremendous	2	1	6	1
	Don't Know	6	9	5	13
Certificated staff	None	1	1	1	1
	Some	14	22	16	24
	Much	50	57	53	54
	Tremendous	32	15	26	18
	Don't Know	4	4	4	4
Teacher Aides	None	1	3	2	3
	Some	30	52	29	52
	Much	49	33	49	34
	Tremendous	18	5	17	7
	Don't Know	2	6	3	5
Administrators	None	2	6	2	6
	Some	23	31	25	37
	Much	41	48	46	41
	Tremendous	29	9	22	12
	Don't Know	6	6	5	5
Students	None	28	29	21	38
	Some	49	61	61	52
	Much	9	3	6	3
	Tremendous	2	1	3	1
	Don't Know	11	6	8	6
Community	None	31	33	30	47
	Some	48	48	49	38
	Much	6	3	5	1
	Tremendous	1	1	1	-
	Don't Know	13	15	16	13
Yourself	None	2	4	2	2
	Some	28	39	38	47
	Much	45	43	40	36
	Tremendous	24	13	19	14
	Don't Know	2	1	2	1
Who most often led the Human Relations Programs for your school or group?	Human Relations chairperson	53	31	40	51
	Human Relations committee member	43	57	55	33
	Don't Know	2	4	2	6
	Other	3	7	3	10
I had some input into what the Tuesday Human Relations Programs would be	Agree	69	53	56	56
	Disagree	31	47	44	44

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 176.
2 " " " " " " " " " " " 383.
3 " " " " " " " " " " " 258.
4 " " " " " " " " " " " 294.

communications did not improve among the total staff. Fifty-two percent of all elementary respondents, 49% of the 934 elementary respondents, and only 36% of the 822 elementary respondents said communications had improved among the total staff. A similar pattern of responding prevailed concerning communications among teachers, between teachers and administrators, between staff and students, between certificated and civil service personnel, and between school and community.

While 74% of all elementary respondents and 76% of the 934 elementary respondents said that overall, the HRP had improved interpersonal relations in their school, only 62% of the respondents from 822 elementary schools agreed that things had improved. There was very little variation in response at the secondary level. At both the elementary and secondary levels, fewer respondents from 822 schools said their school had developed a greater togetherness as a result of the program. See Table 33 or page 73.

Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Among elementary respondents, the 934 participants were more likely and the 822 participants were less likely than were respondents generally to see the HRP as directly related to desegregation. At both the elementary and the secondary levels, respondents from 822 schools were more likely and respondents from 934 schools were less likely than were respondents generally to say the program was not related to desegregation.

Compared to elementary respondents generally, more of the 934 participants and fewer of the 822 participants said the program would help their staff implement the desegregation plan in their school and that the climate within their school was more conducive to desegregation/integration as a result of the HRP. There was very little variation on these two questions at the secondary level.

Table 33. Effects of the HRP on Communications and Interpersonal Relationships

Question	Response	934 Percent Elem, N191[1]	934 Percent Secondary N419[2]	822 Percent Elem, N288[3]	822 Percent Secondary N322[4]
I feel that I improved my interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP	Agree	68%	60%	60%	50%
	Disagree	32	40	40	50
Did communications improve in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program?					
The total staff	Yes, Improved	49	35	36	33
	No, Did Not Improve	20	32	29	36
	No, But Needed No Improvement	4	1	7	3
	Don't Know	27	32	28	28
Among teachers	Yes, Improved	47	43	37	43
	No, Did Not Improve	18	26	28	32
	No, But Needed No Improvement	8	4	7	4
	Don't Know	27	27	27	21
Between teachers and administrators	Yes, Improved	37	26	27	27
	No, Did Not Improve	19	34	24	41
	No, But Needed No Improvement	12	5	10	6
	Don't Know	32	35	39	26
Between staff and students	Yes, Improved	39	26	27	23
	No, Did Not Improve	17	31	23	37
	No, But Needed No Improvement	3	4	7	5
	Don't Know	41	40	43	35
Between certificated and civil service personnel	Yes, Improved	40	40	34	37
	No, Did Not Improve	19	28	23	27
	No, But Needed No Improvement	10	6	11	7
	Don't Know	30	27	33	30
School and community	Yes, Improved	25	11	14	10
	No, Did Not Improve	27	35	31	40
	No, But Needed No Improvement	2	2	4	2
	Don't Know	47	52	50	48
Overall, what impact did the Human Relations Program have on inter-personal relations in your school or group?	Improved greatly	12	5	3	3
	Improved some	64	57	63	60
	Did not improve	18	25	21	26
	Became worse	3	11	8	7
	No improvement was needed	4	1	6	3
The members of my school or group developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP	Agree	61	44	47	34
	Disagree	39	56	53	66

[1]The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 176.
2 " " " " " " " " " " 383.
3 " " " " " " " " " " 258.
4 " " " " " " " " " " 294.

Table 34. Relation of the HRP to Desegregation/Integration

Question	Response	934 Percent Elem, N191[1]	934 Percent Secondary N419[2]	822 Percent Elem, N288[3]	822 Percent Secondary N322[4]
Was the purpose of the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the desegregation-integration plans of the Minneapolis Public Schools?	Yes, directly related to desegregation	30%	17%	13%	16%
	Possibly, but the relationship was not clear	58	66	63	63
	No, not related to desegregation	13	17	24	21
Will the Human Relations Program help your staff implement the desegregation-integration plan in your school or group?	Yes	41	18	21	20
	No, programs not relevant to desegregation	14	23	23	23
	No, did not learn anything related to desegregation	13	20	18	19
	Don't Know	32	39	38	38
The climate within my school or group is more conducive to desegregation-integration as a result of the HRP	Agree	51	31	32	32
	Disagree	49	69	68	68

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 176.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " 383.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " 258.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " 294.

Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

While 90% of all elementary respondents said the Human Relations Day had been a success, only 84% of the elementary 934 and 83% of the elementary 822 participants agreed. At the secondary level, the 822 respondents were more likely to agree it had been a success. At the elementary level, both groups were less likely than were participants generally to say they had learned some things from the HRP that would enable them to create better learning environments. However, at the secondary level, the 934 participants more frequently agreed they had learned such things.

While the elementary 934 respondents were similar to respondents generally, the 822 elementary respondents were less likely to agree they were doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP. At the secondary level, a larger proportion of respondents from both these groups than of respondents citywide said they were doing something differently as a result of the program.

Table 35. Perceived Effects of the HRP on Students

Question	Response	934 Percent Elem N191[1]	934 Percent Secondary N419[2]	822 Percent Elem. N288[3]	822 Percent Secondary N322[4]
The Human Relations day on April 10 was a success	Agree	84%	50%	83%	58%
	Disagree	16	50	17	42
I learned some things from the HRP that will enable me to create better learning environments	Agree	76	68	70	58
	Disagree	24	32	30	42
I am now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP	Agree	54	43	42	39
	Disagree	46	57	58	61

[1] The minimum number of respondents for any single question was 176.
[2] " " " " " " " " " " 383.
[3] " " " " " " " " " " 258.
[4] " " " " " " " " " " 294.

Perceived Value of the Program

While about two-thirds of the 934 elementary respondents--about the same as for respondents citywide--said the program was either worthwhile or very worthwhile to them, only 55% of the 822 elementary respondents said it was. Secondary respondents from both these groups of schools were just slightly more likely to say the program was worthwhile or very worthwhile. Participants from the 822 elementary schools were less likely than participants citywide or 934 participants to agree there was a need for more human relations training in their schools. On the other hand, 822 secondary respondents were more likely to voice this need.

At the elementary level, both groups were slightly less likely than were participants generally to voice an interest in participating in more human relations training and planning. At the secondary level the 822 participants more frequently and the 934 participants less frequently than participants generally said they would be interested in further participation.

Table 36. Perceived Value of the Program

Question	Response	934 Percent		822 Percent	
		Elem. N191[1]	Secondary N419[2]	Elem. N288[3]	Secondary N322[4]
All in all, how worthwhile was the Tuesday Human Relations Program to you?	Very worthwhile	10%	7%	7%	5%
	Worthwhile	57	37	48	41
	Not very worthwhile	29	45	37	43
	Worthless	5	11	9	11
There is a need for more human relations training within my school or group	Agree	66	58	58	66
	Disagree	34	42	42	34
I am interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning	Agree	46	37	45	50
	Disagree	54	63	55	50
Our school or group has made some plans as a result of the HRP	Agree	53	32	47	28
	Disagree	47	68	53	72

Summary

Twenty-two schools had had previous human relations training through Project 822 (1970-71) and/or Project 934 (1972-73). These programs differed from the HRP in that they were voluntary, they included students and community representatives, and participants were paid. Although it was not known what proportion of staff members currently employed at these 22 schools had taken part in these previous programs, responses of staff members of these schools were compared with responses of staff members citywide. Respondents from the 934 elementary schools tended to be more positively oriented toward the HRP than were respondents citywide and respondents from the 822 elementary schools tended to be less positively oriented.

At the secondary level the 822 respondents were more similar to the 934 respondents and both groups varied less from the city-total results than they did at the elementary level. At the secondary level, these two groups of schools were frequently more positive toward the program than were respondents citywide.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As in most large scale training programs, some positive and some negative results were found for the Minneapolis Human Relations Program.

On the positive side it appears that most participants felt at least somewhat involved in the activities of the HRP. Also, most people felt that they had improved their interpersonal communication skills, a major objective of the training. Additionally, teachers seemed to feel that students would be helped by this project. The Human Relations Day was seen as a success and most teachers felt that better learning environments for children had been established. Finally, a need for more human relations training was seen by a majority of participants.

On the negative side, there seems to have been some lack of clarity about the purpose of the Human Relations Program. The relation of developing communication skills to the desegregation/integration plan was not clear to many. Most participants did not feel that the program would aid in implementing the desegregation plan or in improving the climate for desegregation in the schools. The needs assessment process appears to have been a weak point. Many respondents did not feel that the needs assessment approach had identified their major communication needs, and many participants did not even know which needs had been identified. Despite the finding that most participants felt a need for more human relations training, a majority of participants also indicated that they would not like to engage in future human relations training. Whether or not this paradoxical finding indicates that participants felt that others needed the human relations training while they themselves did not, or possibly that many just did not like the specific type of training used during this program, is conjectural.

Given this balance of positive and negative results, it is not surprising that about half of the participants felt that the program was worthwhile while the other half did not feel that it was worthwhile.

Since these results are all based on the opinions of participating school staffs it must be remembered that the true determination of the impact of this training program cannot be made simply from that viewpoint. One person may have said that the program was not worthwhile because the training revealed things about him that he did not want to have revealed. Another person may

have said the program was not worthwhile simply because he did not gain what he considered useful information from it. This limited evaluation of the program must be seen in perspective. Opinions of participants are important, but they do not tell the whole story. More objective measures of the program impact are needed.

Respondents from elementary schools were consistently more positive toward the program than were respondents from secondary schools. Some possible reasons for this pronounced difference were: the departmentalized structure of the secondary schools, in which there is less interdependence among personnel; the different schedules for desegregation at the elementary and secondary levels, with the secondary levels being affected first; a sex-linked attitude difference attributable to the fact that most of the elementary personnel are women and most of the secondary personnel are men; differences in size of staff and student enrollment, with the average size of secondary schools being over twice as large as the elementary schools; and the greater frequency with which the human relations sessions were led by the human relations chairperson at the elementary level.

Recommendations

Because of the pronounced differences found between some of the groups compared in this evaluation, it is recommended that sex and level of instruction--elementary or secondary--be obtained for all future evaluations.

It is also recommended that the possibility of scheduling preparation time for the human relations chairpersons and the desirability of dividing duties between co-chairpersons in the larger secondary schools be considered. The less positive results from the secondary schools, where human relation chairpersons were less frequently said to have led the sessions, could indicate a burden of duties and responsibilities exceeding the chairpersons' available time.

Appendix

City Total Results

Minneapolis Public Schools

This questionnaire asks for your opinions about the Human Relations Program held in all Minneapolis Schools on Tuesdays since January 9. There are no right or wrong answers; just opinions. You need not sign your name.

1. Did you have a clear idea of the purpose or goals of the Human Relations Program?

61 1. Yes

39 2. No

2. Do you think that the communication needs identified by your school or group (using the needs assessment procedures--Nov. 1972) were the more important communication needs of your school or group?

54 1. Yes

20 2. No

26 3. Not sure what needs were identified

3. Was the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the communication needs of your school or group?

32 1. Related to our needs and effective in meeting them

37 2. Related to our needs, but not effective in meeting them

18 3. Not related to our needs, but useful

13 4. Not related to our needs and not useful

Indicate whether or not communications improved in your school or group as a result of the Human Relations Program. Circle the appropriate number for each group.

		Yes, Improved	No, Did Not Improve	No, But Needed No Improvement	Don't Know
4.	The total staff	1 44	2 25	3 5	4 26
5.	Among teachers	1 47	2 22	3 7	4 24
6.	Between teachers and administrators	1 31	2 28	3 9	4 32
7.	Between staff and students	1 32	2 26	3 5	4 37
8.	Between certificated and civil service personnel	1 41	2 21	3 11	4 27
9.	School and community	1 17	2 30	3 3	4 50

How much involvement was there from each of the following groups in your Human Relations Program? Circle one item for each answer.

		Amount of Involvement								Don't Know
		None	Some	Much	Tremendous					
10.	Clerical staff	1 4	2 48	3 36	4 6					5 5
11.	Custodial staff	1 17	2 56	3 18	4 3					5 7
12.	Certificated staff	1 1	2 19	3 54	4 22					5 3
13.	Teacher Aides	1 6	2 43	3 36	4 9					5 7
14.	Administrators	1 4	2 28	3 46	4 17					5 5
15.	Students	1 25	2 57	3 8	4 2					5 8
16.	Community	1 33	2 46	3 5	4 1					5 15
17.	Yourself	1 2	2 35	3 45	4 17					5 1
18.	Others (specify)_____	1 9	2 21	3 11	4 10					5 49

19. Was the purpose of the Human Relations Program in your school or group related to the desegregation-integration plans of the Minneapolis Public Schools?

18 1. Yes, directly related to desegregation

59 2. Possibly, but the relationship was not clear

23 3. No, not related to desegregation

20. Will the Human Relations Program help your staff implement the desegregation-integration plan in your school or group?

26 1. Yes

21 2. No, programs not relevant to desegregation

17 3. No, did not learn anything related to desegregation

35 4. Don't know

21. Overall, what impact did the human relations program have on interpersonal relations in your school or group?

6 1. Improved greatly

63 2. Improved some

20 3. Did not improve

6 4. Became worse

5 5. No improvement was needed

Indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number. HRP stands for Human Relations Program.

		Agree		Disagree
22.	I am now doing something differently in working with students as a result of the HRP (Human Relations Program)	1 43	2	57
23.	I had some input into what the Tuesday Human Relations Programs would be	1 63	2	37
24.	I learned some things from the HRP that will enable me to create better learning environments	1 69	2	31
25.	There is a need for more human relations training within my school or group	1 62	2	38
26.	I am interested in participating in more human relations programs and planning	1 46	2	54
27.	The Human Relations day on April 10 was a success	1 73	2	27
28.	The members of my school or group developed a greater togetherness as a result of the HRP	1 51	2	49
29.	Our school or group has made some plans as a result of the HRP	1 41	2	59
30.	The climate within my school or group is more conducive to desegregation-integration as a result of the HRP	1 36	2	64
31.	I feel that I improved my interpersonal communication skills as a result of the HRP	1 62	2	38

32. Who most often led the Human Relations Programs for your school or group?

53 1. Human relations chairperson

39 2. Human relations committee member

3 3. Don't know

4 4. Other (specify)_____

Different schools and groups worked on different problem solving and interpersonal skills during their Human Relations Program. Please indicate the activities in which you participated and whether or not you acquired the skills. Circle one number for each item.

		Participated Acquired Needed Skill	Participated Did Not Acquire Needed Skill	Participated Already Had Skill	Did Not Participate	Do Not Remember
33.	Problem identification	1 42	2 15	3 32	4 5	5 6
34.	Diagnosis through force field technique	1 30	2 19	3 14	4 13	5 24
35.	Problem analysis and gathering	1 34	2 15	3 27	4 10	5 14
36.	Deriving implications and action alternatives	1 27	2 16	3 19	4 13	5 25
37.	Brainstorming, fishbowling, other small group activities	1 42	2 11	3 32	4 7	5 8
38.	Planning, for action	1 32	2 15	3 25	4 13	5 14
39.	Evaluation	1 33	2 15	3 31	4 10	5 11
40.	Application of problem solving skills	1 39	2 16	3 27	4 7	5 11
41.	Team planning	1 35	2 12	3 26	4 13	5 13
42.	Methods of creating an open learning environment	1 21	2 13	3 16	4 25	5 25
43.	Ways of working together cooperatively and being mutually supportive in developing a total learning environment	1 36	2 14	3 24	4 12	5 14
44.	Listening and saying skills	1 46	2 12	3 29	4 6	5 6
45.	Behavior observation	1 40	2 11	3 32	4 9	5 8
46.	Describing and accepting feelings	1 39	2 13	3 30	4 9	5 9
47.	Giving and receiving feedback	1 45	2 13	3 30	4 6	5 6
48.	Helper and helpee skills	1 34	2 14	3 22	4 12	5 18
49.	Seeking and giving information and opinion	1 34	2 13	3 31	4 11	5 12
50.	One-way and two-way communication	1 42	2 12	3 30	4 8	5 8
51.	Communicating under pressure	1 33	2 23	3 20	4 12	5 12
52.	Observing and analyzing group interaction	1 42	2 14	3 27	4 8	5 9
53.	Dealing with clear and unclear goals	1 34	2 27	3 17	4 10	5 13
54.	Making decisions in groups	1 44	2 18	3 28	4 5	5 6
55.	Leadership roles and group productivity	1 33	2 19	3 23	4 12	5 12
56.	Summarizing	1 30	2 14	3 28	4 14	5 14
57.	Analyzing leadership styles	1 32	2 16	3 19	4 17	5 16
58.	Dealing with group pressure, conformity and influence	1 35	2 22	3 21	4 10	5 12
59.	Dealing with conflict	1 33	2 25	3 22	4 10	5 10
60.	Utilization of group resources	1 34	2 16	3 22	4 13	5 15
61.	Spotting and dealing with hidden agendas	1 29	2 22	3 15	4 15	5 19
62.	Increasing awareness of helping and hindering behaviors (Gate keeping, harmonizing, encouraging, compromise)	1 36	2 14	3 19	4 13	5 18
63.	Identifying various effects of leader behaviors on group interactions i.e. climate setting, norm setting, debriefing, etc.	1 33	2 15	3 16	4 16	5 19
64.	Means of addressing and understanding a point of view different from one's own	1 36	2 13	3 27	4 12	5 12
65.	Giving and receiving help	1 38	2 11	3 32	4 9	5 10
66.	Ways to share problems with others	1 36	2 11	3 29	4 12	5 12

67. All in all, how worthwhile was the Tuesday Human Relations Program to you?

__9__ 1. Very worthwhile

__45__ 2. Worthwhile

__37__ 3. Not very worthwhile

__9__ 4. Worthless

Which aspects of the Human Relations Program were most valuable to you?

1._____

2._____

3._____

Which aspects of the Human Relations Program were of little or no value?

1._____

2._____

3._____

68. What is your position?

__5__ 1. Clerical staff

__2__ 2. Custodial staff

__4__ 3. Administrator

__74__ 4. Non-administrative certificated staff

__9__ 5. Teacher aide

__*__ 6. Student

__*__ 7. Community

__6__ 8. Other (specify)_____

*=Less than 1%

69-71 ___ ___ ___ Name of school or location_____

(Enter number provided by Human Relations chairperson)

77-80 ____ ____ ____ ____

If you have additional comments or suggestions to make write them here and continue on the reverse side of this page if necessary.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

April 1973

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division